

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 11, 1962:

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Amanda E. Meisgeier, Los Olivos.
Doris E. Van Meter, Redway.
Lenora A. Milhoan, San Ardo.

IDAHO

Berniece B. Evans, McCammon.

MISSISSIPPI

Beryl P. Kaigler, Fernwood.

OKLAHOMA

J. Hugh Bryant, Sand Springs.

WISCONSIN

Ivan J. Cowen, Caledonia.
Iva E. Beech, Coloma.

CONNECTICUT

Caroline J. Grote, Chester.

ILLINOIS

Floyd R. Chaplin, Harvey.

INDIANA

Vaughn L. Kostielny, Avilla.
Hiram T. Staples, Greensburg.

MISSISSIPPI

Arjenter B. Cardwell, Harrisville.

VERMONT

Howard H. Bartlett, West Dover.

TEXAS

Jacob E. Shoaf, Quitman.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Kenneth P. Steinreich, of New York, to be a member of the Advisory Board for the Post Office Department.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H. Con. Res. 570. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the situation in Berlin; and

H. Con. Res. 583. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of 185,000 copies of the Constitution of the United States and the amendments thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income; and

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BYRD of Virginia, Mr. KERR, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CURTIS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12580) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 20, 27, and 33.

The message also announced the appointment of Mr. ROBERTSON as a conferee on the bill (H.R. 12276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

UNPATENTED MINING CLAIMS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the question on the adoption of the conference report on the bill (S. 3451) to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes.

The question is on the adoption of the conference report.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, on this I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 182, nays 78, not voting 176, as follows:

[Roll No. 290]

YEAS—182

Abernethy	Gonzalez	Natcher
Albert	Granahan	Nix
Alford	Grant	Norrell
Andersen,	Gray	Nygard
Minn.	Green, Pa.	O'Brien, N.Y.
Ashley	Hagan, Ga.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ashmore	Hagen, Calif.	Olsen
Avery	Halleck	Osmer
Baldwin	Halpern	Passman
Barrett	Hansen	Patman
Bass, Tenn.	Hardy	Pelly
Battin	Harris	Perkins
Beckworth	Harrison, Wyo.	Pfost
Bennett, Fla.	Healey	Pilcher
Boggs	Hechler	Poff
Boland	Hemphill	Price
Bolling	Henderson	Pucinski
Bonner	Herlong	Purcell
Brooks, Tex.	Holland	Randall
Broomfield	Horan	Rhodes, Ariz.
Burke, Mass.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Pa.
Burleson	Ichord, Mo.	Rivers, S.C.
Byrne, Pa.	Jarman	Roberts, Tex.
Cahill	Jennings	Rodino
Casey	Joelson	Rogers, Fla.
Chelf	Johnson, Calif.	Rosenthal
Chenoweth	Johnson, Md.	Rostenkowski
Clark	Jones, Mo.	Roush
Cohelan	Karsten	Rutherford
Colmer	Kearns	St. Germain
Cook	Keith	Selden
Cooley	Kelly	Sikes
Cunningham	Keogh	Sisk
Daddario	Kilgore	Slack
Daniels	King, Calif.	Smith, Iowa
Davis, Tenn.	Kirwan	Smith, Miss.
Dawson	Kitchin	Smith, Va.
Delaney	Kluczynski	Spence
Dent	Kornegay	Steed
Derwinski	Landrum	Stephens
Dowdy	Lane	Stubblefield
Downing	Lankford	Taylor
Dulski	Latta	Thomas
Dwyer	Lennon	Thornberry
Edmondson	Lesinski	Toil
Everett	Libonati	Trimble
Fallon	McFall	Tuck
Fascell	McMillan	Udall, Morris K.
Feighan	Macdonald	Vanik
Finnegan	Madden	Waggonner
Fisher	Mahon	Walter
Flood	Mailliard	Weaver
Forrester	Matthews	Westland
Fountain	Morrow	Whitener
Frelinghuysen	Mills	Whitten
Garmatz	Monagan	Wickersham
Gary	Montoya	Wildnall
Gavin	Morris	Willis
Gialmo	Multer	Winstead
Gilbert	Murphy	Young
	Murray	Zablocki

NAYS—78

Abbitt	Bray	Dague
Alger	Broyhill	Derounian
Anderson, Ill.	Bruce	Dole
Ashbrook	Cannon	Dorn
Ayres	Chamberlain	Ford
Bates	Church	Fulton
Becker	Clancy	Goodell
Beermann	Collier	Goodling
Betts	Corbett	Griffin
Bolton	Cramer	Gross
Bow	Curtis, Mo.	Gubser

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Ephesians 4: 1: I therefore beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.

Almighty God, we earnestly pray that the holiness of the life and the heroism of the faith of our blessed Lord may daily be given a larger and more welcome place in our minds and hearts and find a richer outflow in Christlike character and conduct.

May we yield ourselves without reservation or restraint to those disciplines whereby we are made ready to know and worthy to receive a more vivid experience of the spiritual realities and a more intimate fellowship with Him whose name is above every name.

Show us how to be rich in that love and those ambitions which never seek their own and in that courage which remains strong and steadfast when the winds are contrary.

Grant that our mental attitudes, and our methods of approach to our difficult problems may all be under the inspiration and guidance of Thy Holy Spirit whose will and ways are fundamental and final, immutable and inescapable.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

Hall	Milliken	Ryan, N.Y.
Harsha	Minshall	St. George
Hosmer	Moeller	Saylor
Jensen	Moore	Schenck
Johansen	Moose	Schneebell
Jonas	Mosher	Schweiker
King, N.Y.	Norblad	Springer
Knox	Ostertag	Stafford
Kunkel	Pike	Taber
Langen	Pirnie	Thomson, Wis.
Lindsay	Quile	Tupper
Mathias	Ray	Utt
May	Reece	Van Pelt
Meador	Riehlman	Wharton
Miller, N.Y.	Roudebush	Williams

NOT VOTING—176

Adair	Gallagher	O'Hara, Mich.
Addabbo	Garland	O'Konski
Alexander	Gathings	O'Neill
Andrews	Glenn	Peterson
Anfuso	Green, Oreg.	Philbin
Arends	Griffiths	Pillion
Aspinall	Haley	Poage
Auchincloss	Harding	Powell
Baker	Harrison, Va.	Rains
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Reifel
Barry	Harvey, Mich.	Reuss
Bass, N.H.	Hays	Riley
Belcher	Hébert	Rivers, Alaska
Beil	Hiestand	Roberts, Ala.
Bennett, Mich.	Hoeven	Robison
Berry	Hoffman, Ill.	Rogers, Colo.
Blatnik	Hoffman, Mich.	Rogers, Tex.
Blitch	Hollfield	Rooney
Boykin	Hull	Roosevelt
Brademas	Inouye	Roussetot
Breeding	Johnson, Wis.	Ryan, Mich.
Brewster	Jones, Ala.	Santangelo
Bromwell	Judd	Saund
Brown	Karth	Schadeberg
Buckley	Kastenmeier	Scherer
Burke, Ky.	Kee	Schwengel
Byrnes, Wis.	Kilburn	Scott
Carey	King, Utah	Scranton
Cederberg	Kowalski	Seely-Brown
Celler	Kyl	Shelley
Chiperfield	Laird	Sheppard
Coad	Lipscomb	Shipley
Conte	Loser	Short
Corman	McCulloch	Shriver
Curtin	McDonough	Sibal
Curtis, Mass.	McDowell	Siler
Davis	McIntire	Smith, Calif.
James C.	McSweeney	Staggers
Davis, John W.	McVey	Stratton
Denton	MacGregor	Sullivan
Devine	Mack	Teague, Calif.
Diggs	Magnuson	Teague, Tex.
Dingell	Marshall	Thompson, La.
Dominick	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, N.J.
Donohue	Martin, Nebr.	Thompson, Tex.
Dooley	Mason	Tollefson
Doyle	Michel	Ullman
Durno	Miller	Van Zandt
Elliott	George P.	Vinson
Ellsworth	Moorehead,	Wallhauser
Evins	Ohio	Watts
Farbstein	Moorhead, Pa.	Wels
Fenton	Morgan	Whalley
Findley	Morrison	Wilson, Calif.
Fino	Moss	Wilson, Ind.
Flynt	Moulder	Wright
Fogarty	Nedzi	Yates
Frazier	Nelsen	Younger
Friedel	O'Brien, Ill.	Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Wallhauser for, with Mr. Wilson of California against.

Mr. Hébert for, with Mr. Roussetot against.

Mr. Baring for, with Mr. Schadeberg against.

Mr. Harding for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. Rogers of Colorado for, with Mr. Brown against.

Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Harvey of Indiana against.

Mr. Ullman for, with Mr. Hiestand against.

Mr. Burke of Kentucky for, with Mr. McCulloch against.

Mr. Inouye for, with Mr. Martin of Nebraska against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Teague of California against.

Mr. Staggers for, with Mr. Devine against.

Mr. Magnuson for, with Mr. McIntire against.

Mr. Moorhead of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts for, with Mr. Garland against.

Mr. Auchincloss for, with Mr. Wilson of Indiana against.

Mr. Sheppard for, with Mr. Younger against.

Mr. Shelley for, with Mr. Smith of California against.

Mr. Miller of California for, with Mr. Laird against.

Mr. Mack for, with Mr. Hoeven against.

Mr. Fogarty for, with Mr. Hoffman of Illinois against.

Mr. Dingell for, with Mr. Harvey of Michigan against.

Mr. Loser for, with Mr. Bell against.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Morrison for, with Mr. McVey against.

Mr. Doyle for, with Mr. Scherer against.

Mr. Siball for, with Mr. Nelsen against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Haley with Mr. Belcher.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Denton with Mr. Durno.

Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Garvin.

Mr. Buckley with Mr. Tollefson.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Conte.

Mr. Powell with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.

Mr. Rooney with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Kyl.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Glenn.

Mr. John W. Davis with Mr. Judd.

Mr. Nedzi with Mr. O'Konski.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Appropriations I submit a report (Rept. No. 2551) on the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 903) making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes and ask unanimous consent that it may be taken up at any time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate and other revenues, receipts, and funds, such amounts as may be necessary for continuing projects or activities which were conducted in the fiscal year 1962 by the Department of Agriculture, including the corporations therein, and the Farm Credit Administration, at a rate for operations not in excess of the current rate (amount appropriated or authorized to be expended in fiscal year 1962), together with such amounts as may be necessary to finance additional projects or increased activities of the Department of Agriculture as agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives at the rate for operations and under the terms, conditions, and provisions contained in H.R. 12648, Eighty-seventh Congress, and additional projects or increased activities included by the Senate and agreed to by the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The joint resolution is referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] that it be in order to consider the joint resolution at any time?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman, this is exactly the same bill as passed by the House but is provided in resolution form and it is not expected that it will have to be called up at all.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Is this a continuing resolution for the appropriations?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is, and it is merely in reserve. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I have discussed the bill with the Members on the other side. We anticipate a meeting this afternoon, and it is anticipated that this matter will be resolved. In fact I feel certain we can and will agree.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I would like to say to the gentleman I can see absolutely no reason why the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate cannot get together on an appropriation bill in a period of 9 or 10 months. For us to be delayed here for this period of time and then be forced into the necessity of adopting a continuing resolution for an appropriation bill because of conflict between the House and the Senate over a fight that was perpetrated not by the membership but by some longstanding disagreements of individuals,

Mr. RHODES of Arizona changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. BECKER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 12648, with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 19, 44, and 47 through 54, and further insist upon disagreement to said amendments.

I think it is high time that we got down to work and these conference committees come back with a conference report and get the work of this body finished.

I sincerely believe that the work of this House can be terminated today, and this sort of resolution is going to continue it on.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I withhold my objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that his objection defeats his own argument. I expect to bring the report back today in agreement and to move on. Should the gentleman object to this proposal, he could thereby have delayed the House 3 days before we could act if ever we should have to fall back on this motion.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Will the gentleman give the rule of the House under which it would be delayed 3 days?

Mr. WHITTEN. In that unless I get such consent, this resolution could not be brought up until it has been filed and laid over.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. This resolution cannot, but a conference report can; so I am not delaying anything.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. But we want this in case we have to fall back on it. Frankly in view of the state of the record and statements in the press I feel the facts concerning your House Committee should be made a matter of record. I would hope that the membership of the conferees both of this body and the other body would get to work and bring back a report today.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman that there has been very little difference at all in my opinion. This is the first time there has been any discussion of the relative merits of the two positions despite press comments and despite debate in the other body.

May I say that if objection is raised here it will lessen the chances of our getting together.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I yield.

Mr. HORAN. The action we are taking carries out exactly what the gentleman from Tennessee wants.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. I do not see that it does. This Congress certainly cannot adjourn unless we perfect appropriation bills, and if conference reports are not filed, we cannot work them out.

Mr. HORAN. If we proceed under the regular order, we would have to wait 3 days more before we could consider the matter.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Tennessee that of course he can object; that is his privilege, but I hope he will not.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If you gentleman can get together in the next few minutes, why do you not go ahead and have your conference and let us delay this resolution for a few minutes so that you can get together?

Mr. WHITTEN. No. I say to the gentleman that I do not anticipate actually needing or using this resolution, but I want to have it for the reasons I have

given. My effort is to expedite the business of the House.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. My only effort is to protect the Members who want to go home and who very badly need to be home.

They have got to campaign. This business of having these arguments in conference committees and not bringing the bills back for consideration is nonsensical.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN reserved all points of order.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE RECESS AT ANY TIME

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for the balance of this week it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during the remainder of the 2d session of the 87th Congress it may be in order to consider conference reports at any time they are reported, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXVIII.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this House well know, I have been in opposition to this abortive Castro blackmail and indemnity demand of dollars for prisoners, \$60 million. I see now that there is a suggestion that CIA funds may be used for this purpose.

I would like to ask anyone in this House, did they knowingly and willingly vote any money or any authorization that would permit \$60 million of the taxpayers' money or even foodstuffs to go to Fidel Castro, whom I thought Congress in its recent resolution said is the enemy of freedom, whom we are fighting, not helping—even authorizing the President to use force of arms to dispose of this Communist threat to the Western Hemisphere?

Why do we not be compassionate for American prisoners over there? I am just as compassionate for the prisoners Castro now holds as anyone. Why do we not follow up the situation in Cuba by a strong anti-Castro drive? I am compassionate for Americans who are prisoners in Cuba as well. I said yesterday there were 10 of them. I say now there

are at least 20. I have a list of 10 right here.

Why are we not compassionate for American prisoners held in Cuba? Apparently we should be compassionate for all citizens of Cuba who are prisoners of Castro's communism—compassionate for the 100,000 other Cuban prisoners held by Castro on trumped-up charges in Cuban prisons—and certainly for the American prisoners held on charges of a trumped-up nature that Cuba will not even reveal the nature of to the Swiss Embassy.

If we are truly compassionate for all prisoners of communism and Castro's domination our efforts should be consistent with the position taken by this House and the Congress time and time again this session, to exert every effort and pressure to rid this hemisphere of Castro—rather than giving him this added strength in money and/or foodstuffs which he needs badly now because of the failure of his agrarian reform—failure which will have the effect of keeping him in power that much longer.

WEST VIRGINIA NO LONGER SHORTCHANGED—II

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I presented official statistics of the Department of Defense indicating that West Virginia, which ranked 46th in the Nation in the per capita amount of military prime contracts in the last full fiscal year under the Eisenhower administration, now ranks 30th in the Nation under President Kennedy.

In the fiscal year 1960, the total amount of prime military contracts awarded by the Department of Defense amounted to \$36,098,000 for West Virginia—or \$19.51 per person. In the fiscal year 1962, West Virginia obtained \$133,782,000—or \$72.31 per person.

This is a phenomenal rate of increase in military contracts for West Virginia. It represents an increase of 270 percent when measured per capita according to the population of the State of West Virginia. As President Kennedy himself recently pointed out at Wheeling, W. Va., it is an absolute increase of 272 percent.

I would like to point out, Mr. Speaker, that this rate of increase is third in the Nation. There are only two States in the Union—Arkansas and North Dakota—whose rate of increase in per capita military prime contracts was greater than that of West Virginia between the years 1960 and 1962.

This rate of increase for West Virginia is still another example of the fact that President Kennedy is fulfilling his 1960 campaign pledges to the people of West Virginia.

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was unable to be present on October 8 when tribute was paid our colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi, FRANK SMITH. I was unavoidably absent because of the illness of Mrs. Williams.

The gentleman from Mississippi, FRANK SMITH, has made many contributions to the Nation. As an expert on flood control and water resources development, he worked diligently and energetically in those areas. He has been especially helpful on projects in Mississippi and the Midsouth. I am grateful for the assistance he has given me and the residents of my district on matters before the Committee on Public Works.

We are all delighted that FRANK will have further opportunity to serve his country as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority. He is well qualified for the position and I know that he will serve with dignity, honor, and integrity. He has my sincere best wishes in the future.

THE VALOR AND THE SACRIFICES OF JEWS IN DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY AND ITS FREEDOMS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, few of us have fully appreciated the remarkable contributions of our fellow Americans who profess the Jewish faith, to the Armed Forces of our Nation. From colonial days to the present they have been in the forefront of freedom's defenders. In proportion to their numbers, they have compiled an amazing record of heroism that deserves recognition in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The impressive book "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk, gives us this information in complete detail. With this reference, plus extensive research of his own, one of my constituents, Anthony Cama, of Lynn, Mass., has condensed this factual story in a very graphic way. The fact that he, director of the Italian School in Lynn, devoted so much time and writing skill to this unified account of Jewish courage, is in itself a tribute to those ideals that join the separate elements of our pluralistic society into the fellowship of freemen; and their willingness to fight and die for these principles.

The Jewish people are proud of their service in defense of our Nation. As more Americans learn of their inspiring patriotism, it will strengthen all of us to meet the tests ahead, confident that no power on earth can ever divide us because we measure a man not by race or creed but by what he does for our shared heritage.

In this spirit I bring you "A Tribute to Jews in the American Wars," written

by Anthony Cama, from the September 30, 1962, edition of the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post:

A TRIBUTE TO JEWS IN THE AMERICAN WARS (By Anthony Cama)

Out of the tormented cauldron and the crucible of old Europe came the children of Israel to a new and challenging world, a vast virgin continent peopled by a strange and bizarre race of redskin mortals. They came out of thousands of years of struggles and strife, out of the seeds of Moses and Abraham, down from the sacred Mt. Sinai bringing the Ten Commandments to civilizations mute at the presentation of a Divine Creator, the Father of the universe.

They came to America, where the fantastic, unbelievable miracle of freedom of religion was taking place. In their torrential spiritual veins they carried the irresistible ripples of a Messiah called Jesus, who enlightened and inflamed the world with the Cross of love and salvation of man.

And so, into the American colonies came the Jews, a trickle of 2,000 scattered along the Atlantic coast amid a population of 3 million other colonists. Here they had come as Sephardic Jews, who, like the other races, had ventured forth over the menacing ocean roads to escape religious, economical, and political oppression. At last, perhaps, the promised land had been found—thousands of miles away from Judea.

Speaking directly to the many gracious readers who have followed my articles in the pages of the Lynn Sunday Post let it be said that this writer is, above all, a teacher. It is my mission, with the help of God, that I may bring forth to the people how much we owe to the foreign-born for the blessings we enjoy in this great democratic country of ours. This article speaks on this last Sunday of September about the Jews and their undeniable sacrifices to the United States of America.

That I may weave well their historic threads into the resplendent fabric of our Nation's birth and growth let it be known that there were Jews on the voyage of discovery led to America by that immortal Genoese mariner, Christopher Columbus. That intrepid sailer was aided by Spanish Jews and Jewish map and instrument makers.

In the New World the first Jew appeared in New Amsterdam in 1654. He was a determined and proud person by the name of Asser Levy, who mounted guard on equal standing with the Gentiles at the timber walls of a fort in Manhattan. He fought Peter Stuyvesant unwaveringly until he and other Jews were admitted to citizenship in New Amsterdam on April 21, 1657.

I quote from the stirring book, "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk:

"The colonists, who had crossed the Atlantic, likened themselves to the Israelites, who had traversed the Red Sea to reach the Promised Land. They had fought the Indians as the Twelve Tribes had struggled against the Canaanites. Rev. Ezra Stiles, president of Yale College, liked to call America the New Israel. In a sermon in 1775, President Samuel Langdon of Harvard told the Massachusetts Congress that the Hebrew government (as described in the Bible) was a 'perfect republic.' Thomas Paine, in his 'Common Sense,' pointed to the prophet Samuel's rebuke of Israel for desiring a king as a divine 'protest against monarchical government.' The Reverend Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, argued that 'God gave Israel a king in his anger because they had not sense and virtue enough to like a free commonwealth and have Himself for their King.'"

Is it small wonder, indeed, that the tocsin tongue of the Liberty Bell rang out its joyous cry at the signing of the Declaration of

Independence, since it carried an inscription taken from the Old Testament: "Proclaim liberty to all the land and to all the inhabitants thereof."

When the blood of the new Nation erupted like volcanic lava, many Jews joined the Revolutionary cause, serving with honor in George Washington's army. Solomon Etting, of Baltimore, wrote: "The Jews were always at their posts and always foremost in all hazardous enterprises."

Salvador Francis, a popular plantation owner of South Carolina, who earned the appellation of "The Southern Paul Revere," fought three merciless engagements until he was killed and scalped.

David Emanuel, later elected to the governorship of Georgia, was one of the distinguished, fearless spirits in Rebel Town, not far from Augusta. He was sentenced to be shot for his Revolutionary work, but in a daring leap upon a horse, he escaped within the intricate wilds of a dense swamp.

Colonel Franks was an aid, first to Gen. Benjamin Lincoln and later to Gen. Benedict Arnold. After the complete exoneration of himself and others in the treason trial of Benedict Arnold, Franks was promoted and dispatched with secret documents for Ambassador Benjamin Franklin in France. He was included by Thomas Jefferson in his planned delegation to the peace conference.

In the Revolutionary Army, Lt. Col. Solomon Bush served with distinction in the Pennsylvania Supreme Executive Council. A member of his militia, earning a citation for valor by the State's family, Capt. Lewis Bush was fatally wounded in the struggle for Brandywine.

Among the Frenchmen who came to America with Lafayette in 1777 was colorful and dynamic Maj. Benjamin Nones. He served as a private under Count Pulaski and Baron DeKalb. When DeKalb fell in the Battle of Camden in 1780, it was Nones who helped to remove him from the battlefield.

Dr. Phillip Moses Russel was with the Army at Valley Forge during the tragic and trying days of the winter of 1777-78.

No historic writing concerning the valiant Jews who sacrificed and fought for America would be complete without adding to the pages of glory the name of Haym Salomon, a unique hero of the War for Independence. It is estimated that he was instrumental in the pouring of more than \$640,000 into the Revolution in loans for the Army, salaries for the officials and cash for other needed financial aids. He died impoverished at the age of 45. Salomon was born in Lissa, Poland, in 1740 and came to New York after the anguished dismemberment of his native land. He was well educated and could speak 10 languages. He cast his lot with the Sons of Liberty and was arrested many times by the British and flung into prison. Finally caught and tortured, he was condemned to be hanged. With the help of friends he escaped to Philadelphia, where he reestablished his business and supported the starving Colonial Army. James Madison wrote:

"When any member of the Revolutionary Congress was in need, all that was necessary was to call on Salomon."

Another unforgettable man, reputed to be the wealthiest Jew in America, was Aaron Lopez, whose fleet of merchant ships and other properties were confiscated by the British. He gave invaluable financial aid to the cause of liberty during the Revolution.

In the War of 1812, when our young Nation was spreading its sails across the oceans, America fought and destroyed the threat of the Tripolitanian pirates. At that time the freedom of the seas was endangered by the powerful fleets of England, locked in a battle with France. This was mainly a battle of the seas, and the outstanding hero was the French Jewish privateer, Commodore John Ordoneau, whose notable feats are described by William MacLay, historian of the American Navy. The defeat of a British

40-gun frigate by his armed ship, *Prince de Neudchatel*, is a most magnificent naval saga.

Another great fighting mariner was Commodore Uriah P. Levy, who died in 1862 and was one of the highest ranking officers in the Navy. On his return from France his armed ship, *Argus*, destroyed 21 British merchant vessels and captured a number of other ships. Meeting the heavily armed British frigate, *Pelican*, Levy fought a courageous and audacious battle until the *Argus* was sunk and he was taken prisoner. He suffered for 16 months in Dartmoor prison.

When Commodore Levy returned to the United States he worked tirelessly to effect important changes in American Navy procedure. He finally achieved his greatest feat by bringing about the abolishment of corporal punishment in the Navy. On his tombstone is inscribed this singular humanitarianism:

"He was the father of the law for the abolition of the barbarous practice of corporal punishment in the Navy of the United States."

Many were the Jewish hearts and spirits which stood in "the rockets' red glare" when Francis Scott Key wrote "The Star-Spangled Banner."

After the cessation of hostilities in the War of 1812, the growing and expanding America embarked upon an era of the unprecedented growth in all areas. In the 1840's and 1850's the iron rails linked East and West. Telegraph poles sprouted over desert and plain. The eyes and feet of this ambitious infant Nation pointed westward. Then came war with Mexico over Texas.

The doctor who accompanied Gen. Samuel Houston through the war in Texas was a surgeon, Moses Albert Levy. Abraham Wolf was killed in the Battle of the Alamo. A famous Jewish officer of the Mexican War was Surgeon General David de Leon of South Carolina.

General de Leon won the sobriquet "the fighting doctor" in the Battle of Chapultepec. Twice he led cavalry charges into the cannon's mouth. In 1861 he resigned as surgeon major in the Union Army to accept an appointment as First Surgeon General of the Confederacy. More than 57 Jews are prominently mentioned in the records of the Mexican War.

In the War Between the States thousands of Americans fought one another in the unflinching belief that they were right. This grief-filled fratricidal war of South and North, free land and slaveland, revealed the agony of a people fighting 100 years ago for what they believed in via a bloody civil war. Through this episode of heartbreak and chaos Jews fought and died on both sides.

In those days of feverish controversy over slavery Ernestine Rose, an eloquent orator of Polish origin, who was eulogized repeatedly by Susan B. Anthony in her memoirs as a precursor of the movement for women's suffrage, fought slavery heart and voice.

After President Lincoln's call for volunteers, Bret Harte, whose grandfather had been among the Jews who fought in the War of 1812, read a stirring poem, "The Reveille," at a patriotic meeting in California. It became the most widely repeated poem of the day. The last stanza cried out thusly:

"Better there in death united than in life
a recreant, come!
Thus they answered hoping, fearing,
some in faith and doubting some
till a trumpet voice proclaiming,
said, my chosen people, come,
then the drum,
lo! was dumb
for the great heart of the Nation,
throbbing, answered,
Lord we come."

Thousands of Jews answered this call. Simon Wolf, who made the most thorough

study of the subject, estimates that 8,400 Jews served in the Civil War out of a Jewish population estimated at between 100,000 and 150,000. John Seddon, the Confederate secretary of war, is said to have refused a request for high holy day furloughs for Jewish soldiers on the ground that there were 10,000 to 12,000 Jews in the Confederate army, and that "it would disintegrate certain commands if the request was granted."

In New York alone more than 2,000 Jews entered the Union service, and more than 1,000 Jews volunteered from Illinois. It is recorded that there were 8 generals, 21 colonels, nine lieutenant colonels, 40 majors, 205 captains, 325 lieutenants, 48 adjutants, and 25 surgeons.

Seven Jews won the Congressional Medal of Honor during the holocaust and terrible carnage of the Civil War. They were Sgt. Leopold Karpeles, Sgt. Benjamin B. Levy, Sgt. Maj. Abraham Cohn, Sgt. Henry Heller, Pvt. David Orbansky, Pvt. Abraham Vruenwalt, and Cpl. Isaac Gause. How proud, how resplendent, and how brilliant the Star of David glowed into the heart of America.

Wrote Gen. Oliver O. Howard:
"Intrinsically there are no more patriotic men to be found in the country than those who claim to be of Hebrew descent, and who served with me in parallel commands or more directly under my instructions."

The commander of a Southern legion, T. N. Waul said:

"The Jews, as soldiers, were brave, orderly, and well disciplined and in no respect inferior to the gallant body of which they formed a prominent part. Their behavior in camp and in the field was exemplary. No Jew in the command was arraigned before a court martial, and in proportion to their numbers, there were fewer applications for leave of absence, and their regular habits caused very few of their names to appear on the hospital rolls. In battle, without distinction as to race or religion, all were apparently willing and eager for the contest. I will say, however, I never saw nor heard of any Jew shrinking or failing to answer to any call of duty or danger."

An important factor in the development of this wonderful Nation of ours was immigration, which expanded until it reached large proportions. The Jews of America, about 100,000 of them during the Civil War period, now magnified their numbers, as they fled from pogroms in eastern Europe after 1880.

This was the era of the boiling racial cauldron, the crucible melting and blending new foreigners into the virile bloodstream of America, as symbolized by the Statue of Liberty, presented to the United States by France in 1884 and emblazoned with the spiritual poetic cry of Emma Lazarus:

"Give me your tired, your poor,
Your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

During the Spanish-American War more than 5,000 Jews served their country. Casualties among the Jews were 29 killed, 47 wounded, and 28 dead of disease, a total of 104, or 2 percent of the 5,000 Jews under arms.

In 1917 the United States found itself again involved in a war for the preservation of liberty and the rights of man to freedom and human dignity. The Kaiser's Germany, ruthless and merciless, sank American ships and plotted a course of aggression aimed at conquering the world and destroying the great democratic land of America.

In our sanctuary of human rights and unparalleled religious freedom the Jews stood up to be counted, ready to fight and die for the United States, this star-spangled land of promise and hope. Battered and beaten by pogroms and inhuman persecutions in the Old World, they were prepared to sacrifice their lives that this land of ours should not be engulfed by the monstrous tyrannies of despotic imperialism.

Jewish casualties in World War I were 3,500 dead and 12,000 wounded. They had a general of the Army, a general of the Marines, and an admiral in the Navy. The total of officers who served was 9,177.

Congressional Medal of Honor winners were three. They were Sgt. Benjamin Kaufman, a gentle, unassuming lad, who was a product of Brooklyn, N.Y., and who was decorated by nine governments for his deeds of valor and sacrifice in addition to being honored by his country; Sgt. William Sawelson, who was killed in action at Grand Pre on October 26, 1918, and got the award posthumously for bravery above and beyond the call of duty; and Sgt. Sydney Gumpertz, who performed deeds of valor at Bois de Forge on September 26, 1918.

These brave Jews, and innumerable others who had come to our beckoning shores, had escaped from the savage maws of terror, persecution, and suppression rampant in eastern and central Europe. They had thrust themselves forward out of the tyrannical slime and the pestholes of unspeakable pogroms to find the magnificent American dream. They had come into the measureless melting pot of America to become a part of humanity's great hunger for freedom and equality—for justice and a new horizon of hope for their children. It is no wonder, indeed, that they responded so valiantly to fight for their adopted land.

Said Gen. John J. Pershing:

"When the time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted, with our other young Americans. I well remember in my inspection of New York divisions seeing so many patriotic, well-disciplined, well-behaved young Jewish soldiers, whose commanders spoke of them in the highest terms."

It is no wonder, indeed, that decorations and citations for valor given to Jewish-American soldiers in World War I totaled 1,132.

There are no words which this writer can find to speak and write adequately about the awesome suffering of the Jews during the ghastly period of World War II, when the Nazi plague poisoned and infested the whole world. The fearsome carnage in the destruction of more than 6 million Jews by the Nazi regime and all its evil cohorts belongs in so vile an abyss of inhumanity that, for such a puny mortal as myself, words are unattainable.

Let the judgment of the Lord alone stand forever and eternally in the star-filled heavens to shine accusatively upon those nations which dared to challenge the Divine Creator's omnipotence by a decision to annihilate a race of people who had contributed so much priceless spiritual and cultural treasures to the world.

It is with great pride that this writer can point to America, where every man, regardless of race, color, or creed, can walk the earth in dignity and in grace; where any man may enjoy the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

And so we come to the monstrous days of World War II. Here we find our Nation with a total Jewish population of 4,500,000. Out of the 13 million Americans under arms there were 550,000 Jews serving in the Armed Forces of the United States. Their casualties were 11,000 dead and 40,000 wounded. They had one Congressional Medal of Honor winner and 52,000 decorations and citations for valor.

Lieutenant Zussman was just an ordinary youngster from Detroit, Mich., who had held a job as shipping clerk in a store. He was 23 when he joined the Army and was 26 when he made the supreme sacrifice in France on September 21, 1944, as a tank officer to win the Congressional Medal of Honor.

"Four Jewish families contributed 8 members each, 12 Jewish families contributed 7 members each; and 19 Jewish families contributed 6 members each to the Armed Forces. About 60 percent of all Jewish physicians in the United States under 45 were in the service.

"In World War II a different kind of Jewish community participated. In the intervening years the Jews of the United States had developed and matured. The process of Americanization had proceeded unfailingly. The immigrants had made their adjustments. The children, now grown into adults were native born, products of American schools and an American environment. They differed from their fellow Americans only in the traditionally acceptable American way, which leaves to each man the free exercise of his religious convictions."

The above is a direct quotation from the splendid book, "Jews in American Wars," by J. George Fredman and Louis A. Falk. This writer is not only deeply indebted to this book for most of the historic facts used in this article but gives profound thanks to Mrs. Harry Levine of 72 Harwood Street, Lynn, who one most auspicious morning stood in her doorway to speak to me about the value of my articles in the Lynn Sunday Post.

When I mentioned that I had been encountering difficulties in completing such a large writing as this, she graciously let me borrow the book without which I could not have completed this task. I can honestly say that she, a proud Jewess, and I, a teacher-Gentile, were that morning but humble instruments of the Lord in this patriotic endeavor.

The writer cannot conclude this article without mentioning the 309 rabbis who served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. This represented two-thirds of the eligible qualified rabbis of the entire country. Of these, 210 served overseas, accompanying American troops to all the areas of struggle from North Africa to Iwo Jima and Okinawa.

Seven rabbis died in combat areas. They were Rabbis Henry Goody, Samuel D. Hurwitz, Herman L. Rosen, Louis Werfel, Irving Tepper, Nachman S. Oronoff, and Alexander Goode.

It was Rabbi Goode, who, together with three other chaplains, two of the Protestant faith and one of the Catholic faith, figured in the most unique spiritual story of the war. Chaplain Goode and his fellow clergymen; Chaplains Clark V. Poling and George L. Fox, Protestant ministers, and Chaplain John P. Washington, a Catholic priest, made the supreme sacrifice aboard the USS *Dorchester*. They sank with the ship into the depths of the cold Atlantic Ocean, their arms locked together, each one in his own way spiritually intertwined with the Divine Creator.

This will be eternally symbolic of the extinguishable democratic torch which today sheds its halo lumination over the entire globe—a light, guiding, warming, comforting the millions of oppressed peoples, showing the way to this incomparable land of ours, where before the eyes of all other races and creeds the sacred Star of David, glorious and unsullied, emblazons the eloquence of ancient Hebrew contributions to civilization in the words of the Prophet Micah:

"What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy and walk humble with thy God."

ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 287, which was a vote on Senate Joint Resolution 234 to send the joint resolution back to the Senate, I was absent. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH IN BALTIMORE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, this morning's Washington Post quotes the President, speaking in Baltimore last night, as praising the 87th Congress, and saying:

No Congress in our time—and this the records prove—has had a more exceptional 2 years of positive and progressive accomplishment.

As proof of this statement he cited seven acts of this Congress—the trade bill, area redevelopment, manpower retraining, defense appropriations, the space program, drug laws, and minimum wage, each of which received bipartisan support.

He then called for my defeat based on a "negative record."

The record shows that I supported six of the seven bills mentioned by the President. How can they be called positive and negative in the same breath?

I excuse the President of trying to mislead the people of Maryland. I suspect he was provided a political text drafted by a hobgoblin instead of a ghost.

At the same time, since the question has been raised, I want to stand here, Mr. Speaker, in the presence of my colleagues who were witnesses to my votes, and remove any doubts on the score of my position, and in the presence of our Clerk of the House of Representatives, whose official records of this House show how I voted.

From time to time during this Congress the President called for bipartisan support. He received help from the Republican side in many cases, and without it there would be little in the record of this Congress to be praised as "positive and progressive accomplishment."

Mr. Speaker, having given such support, when I thought it was merited, I consider it an injustice to be called "negative."

Such a response from Mr. Kennedy is untrue, ungenerous, and lacking in the spirit of equity that the American people expect of their Presidents.

PRESIDENT'S EFFORTS TO ELECT MORE DEMOCRATS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] who just spoke, is so naive as to think that the present President of the United States concerns himself with the facts when he is making political

speeches, I am afraid the gentleman must be sadly disillusioned, because of the President's action in attempting to elect more Democrats to the House of Representatives and the Senate, when he does not know what to do with the great majority he has right now in both Houses.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day that we have a President who is out in the hustings campaigning for the election of more Democrats and it can somewhat be likened to the old expression of "Nero fiddling, while Rome burns."

This is exactly what is going on. The people are aware of what is going on, and I know they will reflect it come election day, November 6, and reject the President's request to send to Congress just a flock of "yes" men.

REPUBLICAN SUPPORT NOT ACKNOWLEDGED BY PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add a P.S. to the remarks just made by our distinguished colleague from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. Just a few days ago we were here on the floor of the House of Representatives attempting to put through the Kennedy foreign aid bill, which has long had bipartisan support. A great many Republican Members have for years continued to support this program actively on the floor of the House. And yet at the very moment when the distinguished Republican delegation from Minnesota was on the floor speaking for the President's foreign aid bill, the President was in Minnesota knocking their brains out politically. This is not only bad politics, it is bad government and it is against the public interest.

THE CUBAN RANSOM SITUATION

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield so that I may read the rest of these names that I had started to read, when my time had expired. These are Americans who are held prisoners in Cuba, American citizens who are being held prisoners in Cuba on bogus charges:

Raefael del Pino of New York and Miami; Austin Young of Miami; James Wellington King, Miami; Donald Joe Green, York, S.C.; Alfred E. Gibson, Mount Gilbuss, N.C.; James G. Dean, Franklinville, N.C.; Thomas Baker,

Dothan, Ala.; Eustace Denbrunt, Baltimore, Md.; Daniel Carswell, East Chester, N.Y.; and Edmund Taransky, New York City.

Those Members who serve these areas I hope will hear this. These are American citizens.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] has expired.

REPUBLICANS WHISTLING IN THE DARK

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we all know of the big, kind heart of our Speaker; and never has it been shown in greater degree than today. Here we find on the Republican side our good colleagues, many of whom will not be back next year, whistling in the dark. They want to make speeches, loud and long speeches, hoping that by shouting into the gathering hurricane they can quiet the fury of the storm. So our beloved Speaker, out of the kindly depths of a good heart, recognizes them for 1-minute talks, then stops the watch, and permits them ample time to relieve themselves of wind pains.

If the great and gallant soldier from Florida shoots as loudly as he talks, good Providence help the enemy. I never knew a man who could talk louder and do more fighting with words.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great day, a great day to be here to listen to our Republicans whistling to the winds.

CONSIDERATION OF CONFERENCE REPORTS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that it may be very well understood that this session of Congress which has already run much too long should be adjourned as soon as possible.

In saying that I am not taking anyone to task, whether on the other side of the aisle or on this side of the aisle. But certainly if representative government is to be truly representative it is essential that Members who stand for election have an opportunity to be home, back in their districts, in their States, to be with their constituents, to talk with them, to tell them where they stand.

Mr. Speaker, earlier today the Speaker, the majority leader, and the Parliamentarian discussed with me certain arrangements that are always made as we come into the final days of a session. One of those was that conference reports would not have to lay over a day, as pro-

vided in the rules of the House, but could be considered after they are filed.

I want to make it very clear that, first of all, I agreed to that arrangement, as I have agreed to it heretofore when in the minority, as have the leaders on the other side of the aisle when they have been in the minority. As I understand it, it is not designed to take advantage of anyone, to slip through something without knowledge of the Members, but simply to expedite the business of the House of Representatives, and to speed the sine die adjournment.

As far as I can understand, the principal business which still confronts us here in the House of Representatives has to do with conference action and the adoption of conference reports. As far as I am concerned, I have confidence in our conferees on these various matters and I trust that those conference actions that are still in disagreement can be speedily resolved; and when they are resolved, as far as I am concerned, I want it understood that I am ready to take them up whenever there is reasonable information and notice about when they are coming up. But I must say that if one of them is filed on Saturday and we are still here, as we would be if it is filed, I would not want us to have to adjourn over to Monday before we could take up the conference report.

LIMITATION ON RETIREMENT INCOME

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill—H.R. 6371—to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) Section 461 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to general rule for taxable year of deduction) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) DIVIDENDS OR INTEREST PAID ON CERTAIN DEPOSITS OR WITHDRAWABLE ACCOUNTS.—Except as provided in regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, amounts paid to, or credited to the accounts of, depositors or holders of accounts as dividends or interest on their deposits or withdrawable accounts (if such amounts paid or credited are withdrawable on demand subject only to customary notice to withdraw) by a mutual savings bank not having capital stock represented by shares, a domestic building and loan association, or a cooperative bank shall not be allowed as a deduction for the taxable year to the extent such amounts are paid or credited for periods representing more than 12 months. Any such amount not allowed as a deduction as the result of the application of the preceding sentence shall be allowed as a deduction for such other taxable year as the Secretary or his delegate determines to be consistent with the preceding sentence."

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after December 31, 1962."

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on re-

tirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is an example of what I have been talking about for a number of days, and a rather flagrant one, I might say, of nongermane amendments tacked on in the other body which the House has not had an opportunity to consider before a committee.

Mr. MILLS. I think the gentleman refers to a different matter. This is H.R. 6371, which has one amendment.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am sorry. I do have the wrong bill.

Let me ask the gentleman this under the reservation of the right to object. What is this amendment? Is it germane?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman will yield, this amendment to this bill, which of course involved the retirement income credit as it passed the House, is the amendment the House passed yesterday in the form of H.R. 13358, dealing with the mutual savings banks and building and loan association matter, that we discussed yesterday. It is the identical language of the House bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I did have the wrong bill. I had it on this list, but let me say although this is a nongermane amendment, it does not violate the provisions that I have been trying to drive home because it is a matter that was considered and passed by the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, since I could not get recognition under the 1-minute rule, I should like to say in response to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] that I can easily recall the many weeks of this session when all too little was accomplished. I have been constant in my attendance. I have not missed a roll-call and I do not intend at this late stage of the session to watch the deficiency appropriation bill go through this House with only a few minutes of consideration, for it is my understanding that bill is being loaded with more spending in the other body. I want to know what is in it and I would think other Members of the House would want to know what is in this final deficiency appropriation bill. If I can get that information when it comes up for consideration I will have no desire to prolong the session, but I am not going to forfeit my right to put it over for 1 day or even 1 hour or 2 in order to know what is in the bill. I do not care if this session of the Congress continues until Christmas if that is the price that must be paid for the right to know how several hundred million dollars of the taxpayers' money is to be spent. That is the only reason why I have objected to the unanimous consent request, and I have no apology for so doing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as it originally passed the House, it will be recalled, conforms the provisions of the retirement income credit to recent changes in social security legislation. The retirement income credit is designed to provide equivalent treatment for retired citizens who receive taxable retirement income and little or nothing in the form of tax exempt old-age and survivors insurance or railroad retirement. This provision was in the House bill and was accepted by the other body without amendment.

The substantive amendment to the bill was to add without change the language of H.R. 13358 which passed the House without objection yesterday. That bill, as you will recall, will prevent the artificial shifting of the date of crediting interest payments by savings institutions in order to minimize the impact of the new provisions for these institutions contained in the Revenue Act of 1962.

RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

The Clerk read as follows:

OCTOBER 11, 1962.

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, effective immediately.

Sincerely yours,

H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.
There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 833

Resolved, That ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, be, and he is hereby elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Appropriations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, and ask

unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2548)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 2, 4, and 9.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$57,587,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$57,248,400"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 1, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 19, 25, 26, and 27.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,
CARL HAYDEN,
GALE W. MCGEE,
A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
J. GLENN BEALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

OPERATING EXPENSES

Amendment No. 1—General operating expenses: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will provide an appropriation of \$15,974,250 instead of \$16,005,000 as proposed by the House and \$15,992,600 as proposed by the Senate.

In this item as in all subsequent cases reductions proposed by the Senate due to late passage of the bill have been agreed to. In-

creases proposed by the Senate have been agreed to with the exception of \$18,350 for a realty officer, an appraiser, and one clerk.

Amendment No. 2—General operating expenses: Provides \$161,000 payable from the highway fund as proposed by the House instead of \$179,350 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3—Public safety: Appropriates \$57,587,800 instead of \$57,560,000 as proposed by the House and \$57,676,400 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have agreed to provide for 10 additional correctional officers in the amount of \$28,500 in lieu of 40 such officers provided for by the Senate. Other revisions made by the Senate in the House bill have been approved with the exception of the budget clerk in the Municipal Court.

Amendment No. 4—Education: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 5—Education: Appropriates \$57,248,400 instead of \$56,817,000 as proposed by the House and \$57,284,600 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees have approved the following increases: \$192,300 for 41 additional teachers, \$61,800 for additional counselors and \$63,100 for costs related to the program to improve education for culturally deprived children, as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the proposal of the Senate to provide \$135,400 for a one-time complete replacement of obsolete textbooks, but the additional amount of \$25,000 proposed by the Senate for elementary school library books has been denied. Increases provided by the Senate for 2 librarians in elementary schools and for membership in the Research Council of the Great Cities Program have been denied.

Amendment No. 6—Education: Provides \$574,200 for the development of vocational education as proposed by the Senate instead of \$576,700 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 7—Education: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 8—Parks and recreation: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 9—Health and welfare: Deletes language proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 11—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement. It is the intention of the managers on the part of the House to offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will appropriate \$65,386,300 instead of \$66,528,000 as proposed by the House and \$65,508,100 as proposed by the Senate. The conferees are in agreement with the action of the Senate with the exception that an increase of 25 rather than 50 positions is provided for Junior Village.

In agreeing to the amount of \$48,750 for the continuation of the Temporary Home for Soldiers and Sailors the committee of conference wishes it understood that next year some other arrangement for financing this activity must be undertaken.

Amendment No. 12—Health and welfare: Reported in disagreement.

Amendments Nos. 13, 14, and 15—Highways and traffic: Appropriate \$11,418,000, of which \$7,652,126 shall be payable from the highway fund (including \$1,642,100 from the motor vehicle parking account), as proposed by the Senate instead of \$11,470,000, of which \$7,700,476 shall be payable from the highway fund (including \$1,644,000 from the motor vehicle parking account), as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 16, 17, and 18—Sanitary engineering: Appropriate \$20,760,800 of which \$6,861,375 shall be payable from the water fund and \$3,936,650 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the Senate instead of \$20,789,000, of which \$6,872,975 shall be payable from the water fund and \$3,948,600 shall be payable from the sanitary sewage works fund as proposed by the House.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

Amendment No. 19—Capital outlay: Reported in disagreement.

Amendment No. 20—Capital outlay: Provides \$162,000 for purchase of equipment for new school buildings as proposed by the Senate instead of \$223,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, 23, and 24—Capital outlay: Appropriate \$49,451,000 of which \$14,500,000 shall not become available for expenditure until July 1, 1963, \$9,871,142 shall be payable from the highway fund and \$1,193,700 shall be available for construction services as proposed by the Senate instead of \$49,713,000 of which \$13,500,000 shall not be available for expenditure until July 1, 1963, \$10,631,142 shall be payable from the highway fund and \$1,158,700 shall be available for construction services as proposed by the House.

The committee of conference is agreed that construction of the Three Sisters Bridge should proceed according to the plan set forth in the budget in the amount of \$300,000 as provided in the bill. Furthermore, it is the view of the committee of conference that no funds allocated to the District of Columbia's highway program shall be used for the construction of the Glover-Archbold Parkway. The committee of conference further recommends that the District of Columbia cooperate in the preservation of this natural park.

Amendment No. 25—Capital outlay: Reported in disagreement.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendments Nos. 26 and 27—General provisions: Reported in disagreement.

WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
ALFRED E. SANTANGELO,
CLARENCE CANNON,
JOHN J. RHODES,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the House considered budget estimates totaling \$299,134,478 for the District of Columbia for fiscal year 1963. Our committee recommended and the House approved a total of \$290,059,000. This was a reduction of \$9,075,478 below the budget estimates. The bill provided for a Federal payment of \$30 million, which was \$2 million below the budget estimate and the same amount appropriated for fiscal year 1962.

The bill as it passed the Senate contained \$289,253,300, which is a decrease of \$805,700 under the amount approved by the House. The increases in the Senate totaled \$2,420,798 and, due to late passage of the bill in that body, decreases totaled \$526,200. Other reductions totaled \$2,700,298.

For the first time since I have been a member of this committee, the other body made reductions in our bill. Mr. Speaker, this is good procedure and I want you and the Members of the House to know that I commend the action of the Senate subcommittee and the full Committee on Appropriations. We have worked in complete harmony, not only on the welfare program, but on all proposals for the welfare of our capital city. Not only has the House committee carefully considered the budget proposals, but the same action applies to the Senate.

The hearings on both sides disclosed that here in the District of Columbia we are faced with a large public welfare caseload, a difficult crime situation, and

increasing governmental costs. All serious problems, but not insurmountable.

The Federal payment approved by the Senate committee is in the same amount as the House bill.

At the time of the hearings before our committee, the two additional juvenile judges had not been appointed; therefore, the request for more employees and housing space was not in order.

We denied all of these requests. They were granted by the other body because the judges were subsequently named and the requests were then in order.

The welfare program was presented to our committee in such a manner that we could not grant the additional request for employees which were to be used to correct the many deficiencies in this Department. The full report from the General Accounting Office had not been received by our committee when we concluded our hearings. At the time of the hearings on the other side, the final report was in and the Welfare Department was able to make certain sound proposals which could be accepted. Most of the additional employees added to the bill are in this section and were added by the other body after a reasonable program was submitted by the Department of Welfare.

We receded on a great many items in the two programs just described.

During the hearings on the House side, partisans of rapid transit and the proponents of the highway program used every political issue and every possible source of opposition to bring about confusion and disorder. We soon discovered that the rivalry between these two groups is dangerous and certainly not to the best interests of the future development of our Capital City.

During the hearings before the House subcommittee, two of the Commissioners requested that certain sections of the inner loop be held in abeyance and, since our committee is not a policymaking committee, we agreed to this request. We deleted \$170,000 for the east leg; \$450,000 for the Northeast Freeway; and \$546,700 for interchange C. Our committee believes that, where thousands of people will be displaced, every precaution should be taken prior to construction to protect these people before they are forced out of their homes. We have been assured by the Commissioners that, before funds are requested for the deleted items, some solution will be reached solving this major problem.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 291]

Alexander
Alger
Andrews

Anfuso
Arends
Aspinall

Auchincloss
Bailey
Baring

Bass, N.H.
Belcher
Bell
Bennett, Mich.
Berry
Blatnik
Blitch
Boykin
Brademas
Breeding
Brewster
Bromwell
Brown
Buckley
Burke, Ky.
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Chiperfield
Coad
Conte
Corman
Curtin
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, James C.
Davis, John W.
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dominick
Donohue
Dooley
Doyle
Durno
Elliott
Ellsworth
Evins
Farbstein
Fenton
Findley
Fino
Fogarty
Frazier
Friedel
Gallagher
Garland
Gavin
Glenn
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Haley
Harding
Harris
Harrison, Va.

Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hays
Hébert
Hiestand
Hoeven
Hoffman, Ill.
Hoffman, Mich.
Holifield
Hull
Inouye
Jarman
Johnson, Wis.
Jones, Ala.
Judd
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kilburn
King, Utah
Kowalski
Kyl
Laird
Lipscomb
Loser
McCulloch
McDowell
McIntire
McSweeney
McVey
MacGregor
Mack
Magnuson
Marshall
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mason
Michel
Miller
George P.
Moorehead,
Ohio
Moorhead, Pa.
Morgan
Morrison
Moss
Moulder
Nedzi
Nelsen
Norrell
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
O'Neill

Osmers
Passman
Peterson
Philbin
Pillion
Poage
Powell
Rains
Reifel
Reuss
Riley
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts, Ala.
Robison
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Rousset
Santangelo
Saund
Schadeberg
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott
Scranton
Seely-Brown
Shelley
Sheppard
Shipley
Short
Shriver
Sibal
Siler
Smith, Calif.
Stratton
Sullivan
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Ullman
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wallhauser
Watts
Weis
Whalley
Wilson, Calif.
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Yates
Younger
Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). On this rollcall, 262 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1963

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, when the Commissioners appeared before our committee in behalf of the budget requests for fiscal year 1963, the sum of \$300,000 was requested for the Three Sisters Bridge, and \$1,876,800 was requested for the Potomac River Freeway. We approved the two requests and the same action took place in the other body. After approving the \$300,000 for the Three Sisters Bridge, the committee on the other side decided to include certain language in their committee report, which states as follows:

In approving the item of \$300,000 for construction of the Three Sisters Bridge, the Senate Committee on Appropriations takes this action with the understanding that the District of Columbia Highway Department will not proceed with the project until the report of the National Capital Transportation Agency has been submitted in November 1962, and if that report is against the Three Sisters Bridge, the Commissioners shall proceed with the construction of the bridge unless before March 1, 1963, action to negate such construction shall have been taken by either the Senate Committee on Appropriations or the House Committee on Appropriations.

Under no circumstances would we agree to such language and so informed the conferees on the other side. They refused to yield and a stalemate resulted.

I offered language to the conferees which states that the committee of conference is agreed that construction of the Three Sisters Bridge should proceed according to the plan set forth in the budget, in the amount of \$300,000 as provided in the bill. The conferees on the other side refused to drop the language in their report and to accept this language. We refused to yield and, after several days, the vote of the conferees on the other side was tied 4 to 4. The chairman of the full committee on the other side had another conferee named and the Senate finally yielded to the House. The conference report contains the language offered by me under the statement on the part of the managers, and takes the place of the Senate language contained in the Senate committee's report.

The action insisted upon by the House assures the city of Washington that the freeway program will proceed and there is a place in our Capital City for both freeways and rapid transit.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which is in balance. In fact, the bill provides for \$17,255,000 in surplus for the District of Columbia. This, I am told, is ample to meet the pending pay increases as a result of the legislative action which we took in the House and in the Senate this last week.

This is a bill which provides, in my opinion, things the District of Columbia needs in the way of funds for the next fiscal year. Some of the things provided in this bill are schoolbooks, among others. We have heard on the floor of the House and we have seen in the press that the schoolbooks which some of the children in the District of Columbia must use are obsolete; they are in bad condition. All of it to some extent is true.

The conferees appropriated every cent of money which the school system said was needed to replace all obsolescent and wornout books. So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that no longer will we have the spectacle of children who go to the District of Columbia schools walking around with tattered books, many of which were written some 25 years ago, containing material which is not only obsolescent but obsolete.

Also I think it is fair to state that we have done a good job on the physical plant of the schools of the District of Columbia. There is money in this bill for the acquisition of a site and for the planning for replacement of the Hine Junior High School. That is one of the eyesores of the whole District school system, a building the upper stories of which were condemned after a fire that occurred some years ago. This will provide the necessary money for beginning the job of building a new junior high school.

Also we have provided funds for further enlargement of Junior Village. We have provided funds for the construction of additional cottages and an increase in the capacity of that very vital installation.

I think one of the outstanding jobs that has been done as far as the District is concerned since I have been a Member of Congress was done by the committee of the other body, in the welfare program. They held long hearings and they came up with a report which I think makes a lot of sense and certainly brings to light circumstances which none of us ever dreamed existed. They made very sound recommendations for the correction of those matters, and they are included in this conference report.

I might say also that in giving credit to the committee on the other side I would feel remiss if I did not also mention the fact that the committee on this side of the Capitol, in my estimation, under the very able chairmanship of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] has also done as good a job in this field as I have seen done since I have been a Member of Congress.

In my opinion, this bill will in many ways settle many of the questions which existed in the operation of the District of Columbia. But, Mr. Speaker, I would be less than candid if I did not say that many questions still remain unsolved. The District of Columbia has all of the problems inherent in any city, in any State and, in fact, any county; and those problems are still with them, but I think we have made a fairly good start on dealing with many of them.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NATCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. I hesitate to interrupt the gentleman, but I want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee for insisting on an appropriation for the Three Sisters Bridge and including it in this bill. I have no particular interest in this one segment of the highway system that has been proposed for the District of Columbia, but I think it is about time that the House took a firm position in support of continued progress on a highway program for the District. It appears that anyone who has an objection to one particular connection or one particular interchange can object and immediately a "hold" is put on that increment. The result is to destroy the usefulness of the whole circumferential system or the inner and the outer loop as well. So I think it is particularly important and to be appreciated that the House subcommittee held firm on this one item at least so it does provide a connection that will provide one loop that will eventually be complete and make available a bypass for the District.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman, of course, is correct. This will go a long way toward helping solve the dilemma of the District of Columbia highway system. But this is one of the remaining problems to which I had reference and, believe me, this problem is not solved and it will not be solved for

quite some time. I do feel the action taken by the conferees goes a long way toward a solution.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I note by the headlines in the paper this morning that Central Intelligence Agency funds apparently are being contemplated to be used for the purpose of paying ransom to Castro. The gentleman is a very distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations. I would like to ask the gentleman, Does he know of any authority voted by the Congress for any funds that the President could possibly use, or anyone else, as a matter of fact, for this purpose?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. May I say to the gentleman from Florida, as far as funds for the Central Intelligence Agency are concerned, the amount of those funds and the purposes for which they are to be used, is one of the best and most closely guarded secrets in Washington. I am not sure it is such a closely guarded secret in Moscow, but it is in Washington. I do not know too much about it. This is true of all the members of the Committee on Appropriations. This appropriation is handled by a special subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I do not happen to be on that subcommittee, therefore I am unable to answer the gentleman's question. I do not know, of my own knowledge, of any law either authorizing such funds to be used or appropriating such funds for that purpose. If, indeed, such funds have been appropriated, I am ignorant of that fact.

Mr. CRAMER. I may say so far as I am concerned I certainly have never knowingly or intentionally voted for any funds for such purpose, and I do not know that any other Member of the House did.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am glad to have the gentleman's statement. I agree with him.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask a question and to make an observation.

My question is this: Is there any money in this bill for the newly approved project in the District of Columbia known as the \$10 million fish bowl?

Mr. NATCHER. This bill contains no funds for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

May I commend the gentleman and the members of his subcommittee for standing fast with respect to language dealing with the so-called rapid transit project in the District of Columbia. This, as I understand it, might very well involve some several hundred million dollars.

As I further understand the situation, no one is in a position as of this time to state how this money should be expended. I compliment the gentleman from Kentucky and the members of his subcommittee for their tenacity in dealing with the other body in this respect.

Mr. NATCHER. I thank the gentleman, and will say he is absolutely correct about the rapid transit system.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the able gentleman from Kentucky and his fellow managers on the conference committee, and also the members of the Appropriations Committees of both bodies for their diligent work. I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] mentioned the work of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia in the other body. I have been impressed by the fine leadership which has been provided for the District of Columbia Appropriations Subcommittee, as evidenced by the thorough investigations conducted into the welfare program of the District of Columbia. These investigations have been carried on above and beyond the call of average legislative duty, and represent a fine contribution to the work of Congress.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend this fine committee, its chairman, and the ranking members, for the fine job which it has done on this bill.

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, there was a great deal of controversy among the conferees on this appropriation bill concerning a delay in the proposed construction of the Three Sisters Island Bridge across the Potomac River. The District of Columbia's share of the cost of this construction is in the amount of \$300,000, and was included in this bill by both houses of Congress.

The controversy, however, was over language added to the bill by the Senate Committee which provided veto power for the Senate Appropriations Committee, wherein they could halt the commencement of construction of the bridge during the next 5 months. It is my understanding that the objections of the House conferees to this language was over whether or not the House Appropriations Committee should be permitted to have the same veto power.

I wish to state, Mr. Speaker, that I advised some of the conferees that I supported the veto power being included in the bill, and, in fact, would have preferred both Houses having the veto power, due to the fact that there is some feeling that the pending report from the National Capital Transportation Agency, due on November 1, 1962, might show that the construction of this facility may not be necessary. Of course, if this situation does occur I feel that provision should be made to halt construction and therefore I would support any provision to delay construction of this facility until the report is evaluated.

Now, however, the Senate has receded from their insistence on their position and we now find that the appropriation for construction of the bridge contains no restriction to the commencement of construction whatsoever.

As all Members of the House of Representatives know, I have fought continuously for additional river crossings and highway improvements in the met-

ropolitan area throughout the years of my service in the Congress. I have likewise supported appropriations for the construction of the Three Sisters Island Bridge. However, we must recognize that in recent months objections have developed, some of which are from people in my congressional district, to the construction of the bridge, since there is a possibility that a pending rapid transit program may eliminate the necessity for this construction.

The 86th Congress approved a law creating the National Capital Transportation Agency, which was instructed to make a report recommending a mass transit system; showing a need for such a system, the cost of such a system, the financial feasibility and how its costs would be repaid. There is speculation that this report, which is due on November 1, may well show that the Three Sisters Island Bridge is not needed. Furthermore, a subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee has expressed the desirability of holding up any further highway construction of this type which might be proven unnecessary in the report I just referred to.

In view of the fact that this report is forthcoming in the immediate future, I feel that the record should clearly show that even though appropriations have been granted without restrictions the District Commissioners should delay commencement of construction of this facility until the National Capital Transportation Agency report is received and thoroughly evaluated.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to see unnecessary delay in the construction of any of our needed transportation facilities in the National Capital area, but, in view of the statements I have just made, as well as the resolution recently issued by a subcommittee of the House District of Columbia Committee, I would urge that the District Commissioners proceed very slowly with developing their plans for this facility during the next 5-months period, until Congress has had an opportunity to consider and act on the National Capital Transportation Agency report.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered. The conference report was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 1: On page 3, strike out "\$16,005,000" and insert "\$15,992,600".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$15,974,250".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 7: On page 6, strike out "amended" and insert: "and the limitation of \$6,000 included under the heading 'Public Schools' in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1961, for services of experts and consultants is hereby increased to \$7,600."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 8: On page 6, strike out \$8,377,000 and insert "\$8,361,800."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$8,359,800."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: On page 7, insert "and for care and treatment of indigent patients in institutions, including those under sectarian control, under contracts to be made by the Director of Public Health;"

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 11: On page 7, strike out "\$66,528,000" and insert "\$65,508,100".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$65,386,300".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 12: On page 7, insert: "Provided, That the inpatient rate and outpatient rate under such contracts and for services rendered by Freedmen's Hospital shall not exceed \$32 per diem and the outpatient rate shall not exceed \$5 per visit: Provided further,"

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 19: On page 10, line 2, insert "and three children's cottages".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 25: On page 10, line 19, insert "Provided, That not to exceed \$300,000 of funds heretofore appropriated under the heading 'Capital Outlay' shall be available for purchase of furniture and equipment for new dormitories at the District of Columbia Village."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 26: On page 12, line 4, strike out "seventy five" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five (fifty for investigators in the Department of Public Welfare)".

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 26 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 27: On page 15, line 4, insert: "Sec. 16. The salary of the Controller for the Department of Public Welfare shall be at the rate of Grade GS-16 and the Commissioners are authorized to appoint supervisors of investigators for the Department of Public Welfare at Grade GS-11 and investigators at Grade GS-9."

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. NATCHER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a motion to reconsider the

votes by which action was taken on the several motions is laid on the table.

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record a chart concerning the operating

expenses and capital outlay at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1963

Item	Budget estimate	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Operating expenses.....	\$242,428,200	\$237,546,000	\$237,002,300	\$236,735,350	—\$5,692,850	—\$810,650	—\$266,950
Capital outlay.....	57,733,278	52,513,000	52,251,000	52,251,000	—5,482,278	—262,000	—
Total.....	300,161,478	290,059,000	289,253,300	288,986,350	—11,175,128	—1,072,650	—266,950

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks; and that all Members have 3 legislative days to extend their remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL AID HIGHWAY ACT OF 1962

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. NO. 2549)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, and 14.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"INTER-AMERICAN HIGHWAY

"SEC. 4. For the purpose of completing the construction of the Inter-American Highway, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the additional sum of \$32,000,000 to be expended in accordance

with the provisions of section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code: *Provided*, That no part of such sum shall be obligated in any country until that country demonstrates, to the satisfaction of the Secretary, that it is capable of and willing to meet its commitment for maintenance under the agreements entered into pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a)(5) of title 23, United States Code. Not to exceed \$12,000,000 of the funds authorized herein shall be available for contract immediately upon enactment of this Act in compliance with such commitment, except that such contract authority shall be reduced by such amounts as are appropriated for construction of the Inter-American Highway by the Eighty-seventh Congress, second session."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"ALASKA HIGHWAY STUDY

"SEC. 13. (a) The Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with the State of Alaska, is hereby authorized to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to a highway construction program for the State of Alaska, and, in accordance with treaties or other agreements to be negotiated with Canada by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, engineering studies, estimates, and planning surveys relative to connecting Alaskan roads with Canadian roads at the International boundary.

"(b) On or before May 15, 1964, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit a report to the Congress which shall include—

"(1) an analysis of the adequacy of the Federal-aid highway program to provide for a satisfactory program in both the populated and the undeveloped areas in Alaska;

"(2) specific recommendations as to the construction of roads through undeveloped areas of Alaska and connection of such roads with Canadian roads at the International boundary; and

"(3) a feasible program for implementing such specific recommendations, including cost estimates, recommendations as to the sharing of cost responsibilities, and other pertinent matters.

"(c) From time to time, either before or after submission of the report provided for in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary of Commerce may submit recommendations to the Congress with respect to the construction of particular highways to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed as creating any obligation in the Congress, express or implied, to carry out the recommendations referred to in subsections (b) and (c).

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be available until expended, the sum of \$800,000 for the purpose of making the studies, surveys, and report authorized by subsections (a) and (b) hereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT S. KERR,
PAT McNAMARA,
JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
JOHN SHERMAN COOPER,
HIRAM L. FONG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 3: The House bill provided an authorization of \$16,000,000 for parkways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. Senate amendment No. 3 provided for an authorization of \$16,550,000 for such purpose. It is the intention of the conferees that nothing shall be construed as specifically earmarking any of this authorization for particular projects in particular States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 4: The House bill provided authorization of \$3,000,000 for public lands highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, and \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. Senate amendment No. 4 provided authorization of an additional \$6,000,000 for public lands highways for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964; and \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. It is the intention of the conferees that nothing shall be construed as specifically earmarking any of this authorization for particular projects in particular States. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 5: The House bill contained no comparable provision. Senate amendment No. 5 provides for the completion of the Rama Road with an additional authorization of \$850,000 for that purpose. It requires that survey and construction work shall be under the supervision of the Secretary of Commerce and requires the expenditure of funds to be under the conditions set forth in section 213 of title 23 of the United States Code which apply to the authorization contained in that section. It also authorizes funds to be available for contract immediately. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 6: The House bill contains no comparable provision. Senate amendment No. 6 authorizes an additional appropriation of \$32,000,000 for the completion of the Inter-American Highway. This sum is to be expended in accordance with section 212 of title 23 of the United States Code. No part of that sum shall be obligated in any country until it demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Commerce that it is capable of and willing to meet its commitment for maintenance. These sums are authorized to be available for contract immediately on passage of the Act and compliance with the commitment. The House recedes with an amendment which is identical with the Senate amendment, except that

there is imposed a restriction of not to exceed \$12,000,000 on the contractual authority, with the further limitation that this \$12,000,000 contractual authority shall be reduced by any amounts appropriated for the Inter-American Highway during this session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.

Amendment No. 16: Senate amendment No. 16 requires the Secretary of Commerce to make engineering studies and estimates and planning surveys relative to the Alaska highway construction program, including possible interconnections between Alaskan and Canadian highways, requires detailed reports to Congress, authorizes the submission of recommendations to Congress, disclaims the creation of any obligation on the part of Congress to carry out these recommendations, and authorizes the expenditure of \$800,000 to carry out these purposes. The House bill contained no such provision. The House recedes with an amendment which is the same as the Senate amendment except for clarification of certain language to insure that there is no authority to make any extraterritorial study, estimate, or plan of highways in Canada.

Amendments Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 15: These amendments are clerical; the House recedes.

GEORGE H. FALLON,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
ROBERT E. JONES,
WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
JOHN F. BALDWIN, JR.

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, the difference between the bill the House passed and the bill passed by the other body amounted to \$51,400,000 more than the House bill, as we came out of conference.

The additions put in on the Senate side to which the House agreed were, Public Lands and Highways, for 3 years, in the amount of \$18 million; an increase of \$550,000 on parkways; and \$850,000 for the completion of the Rama Road. Also \$32 million for the American Highway completion and \$800,000 for the Alaskan study.

Mr. Speaker, the committee held hearings on all these items that were not in the House bill that were included in the Senate bill. The conferees were very familiar with the need for these items that were included in the House bill to which the conferees receded and concurred in the Senate amendments.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FALLON. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman, the chairman of this very important subcommittee, who has given great leadership throughout the years to this highway legislation. This conference comes back with a unanimous agreement. I think the conferees accomplished some good end results. We certainly did not capitulate to the other body. For instance, we took out \$10 million that had been put in for forest roads and trails. The other body had increased the amount from \$10 million to \$20 million. We were able to get the conferees to agree on the ABC authorizations consistent with the basic law and understanding of the ABC system, on a rate of \$25 million per year going to \$1 billion at that rate.

Therefore, the conferees agreed to accept the House version of the 1960 au-

thorization for ABC at \$950 million; that the 1965 authorization shall be \$975 million, that being \$25 million over the Senate version. Those of us on the committee have felt for some time that this having been understood and agreeable to the committee and in the basic authorization, this should be complied with and that all the States could rely on this.

On parkways \$550,000 was added but, consistent with my views and those of the conferees on the House side the Senate receded on the question of earmarking funds in the parkways program. I have been opposed and remain opposed in this program, which is traditionally a lump sum amount program, to earmarking projects.

On the public lands highways the conferees acceded to the Senate position. On the Inter-American Highway the amendments of the House conferees were agreed to.

On the Alaskan Highway study authorization, pursuant to the House bill, the conferees took the language requested by the House conferees, to make certain that the studies that are made would not authorize either in the form of studies or by implication future construction of any highways, extraterritorial highways, highways outside the territorial limits and boundaries of Alaska. But it does permit consideration to be given to how highways shall be connected up with—obviously the Canadian highways.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good conference report and I recommend its adoption.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BALDWIN].

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to serve on the committee of conference which was headed on the House side by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON]. It has been a privilege to serve with him for the last 8 years on the Roads Subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works. I have admired his fairness and integrity in all the hearings and executive sessions and all the negotiations on this highway bill. The House was represented ably by our House conferees headed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] in the conference.

I share the views of all the other conferees who have spoken that this is a fair and equitable conference report. There was a point in this session where there was some doubt as to whether the Senate was going to request any conference on the highway bill and there was considerable concern on the part of many of the State highway departments that possibly Congress might not take any action on this bill this year. From a date standpoint this bill could have been carried over to January because it applies to the fiscal years 1964 and 1965, but as a practical matter many of the departments need a good deal of leadtime for advance engineering designs and plans and to take the necessary time to put in their own budgets the amounts they will require from Federal funds. Therefore, from the standpoint of keeping the Federal-State highway program moving as

[illegible]

"Salary class and position"	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8	Service step 9
Class 6:									
Group B, master's degree.....	\$11,050	\$11,300	\$11,550	\$11,800	\$12,050	\$12,300	\$12,550	\$12,800	\$13,050
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	11,250	11,500	11,750	12,000	12,250	12,500	12,750	13,000	13,250
Assistant to assistant superintendent (elementary schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).									
Assistant to assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance).									
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.									
Executive assistant to deputy superintendent.									
Principal, elementary school.									
Principal, junior high school.									
Principal, senior high school.									
Principal, vocational high school.									
Principal, Americanization School.									
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.									
Principal, Capitol Page School.									
Principal, health school.									
Principal, laboratory school.									
Principal, veterans high school.									
Class 7:									
Group B, master's degree.....	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850	12,100	12,350
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050	12,300	12,550
Director, elementary education (administration).									
Director in elementary education.									
Director, special education.									
Class 8:									
Group B, master's degree.....	9,850	10,100	10,350	10,600	10,850	11,100	11,350	11,600	11,850
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	10,050	10,300	10,550	10,800	11,050	11,300	11,550	11,800	12,050
Assistant principal, elementary school.									
Assistant principal, junior high school.									
Assistant principal, senior high school.									
Assistant principal, vocational high school.									
Assistant principal, Americanization School.									
Assistant principal, health school.									
Dean of students, teachers college.									
Director, school attendance.									
Registrar, teachers college.									
Supervising director, adult education and summer school.									
Supervising director, athletics.									
Supervising director, curriculum.									
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).									
Supervising director, reading clinic.									
Supervising director, subject field.									
Professor, teachers college.									
Class 9:									
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	8,940	9,190	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940
Group B, master's degree.....	9,440	9,690	9,940	10,190	10,440	10,690	10,940	11,190	11,440
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	9,640	9,890	10,140	10,390	10,640	10,890	11,140	11,390	11,640
Supervising director, food services.									
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.									
Class 10:									
Group B, master's degree.....	9,030	9,280	9,530	9,780	10,030	10,280	10,530	10,780	11,030
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	9,230	9,480	9,730	9,980	10,230	10,480	10,730	10,980	11,230
Assistant director, adult education and summer schools.									
Statistician.									
Class 11:									
Group B, master's degree.....	8,620	8,870	9,120	9,370	9,620	9,870	10,120	10,370	10,620
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	8,820	9,070	9,320	9,570	9,820	10,070	10,320	10,570	10,820
Assistant director, audiovisual.									
Assistant director, practical nursing.									
Assistant director, subject field.									
Associate professor, teachers college.									
Chief librarian, teachers college.									
Supervisor, elementary education.									
Class 12:									
Group B, master's degree.....	8,210	8,460	8,710	8,960	9,210	9,460	9,710	9,960	10,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	8,410	8,660	8,910	9,160	9,410	9,660	9,910	10,160	10,410
Chief attendance officer.									
Clinical psychologist.									
Class 13:									
Group B, master's degree.....	7,395	7,710	8,025	8,340	8,655	8,970	9,285	9,600	9,915
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	7,595	7,910	8,225	8,540	8,855	9,170	9,485	9,800	10,115
Assistant professor, teachers college.									
Psychiatric social worker.									
Assistant professor, laboratory school.									

"Salary class and position"	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7
Class 14:							
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	\$6,030	\$6,285	\$6,540	\$6,795	\$7,050	\$7,305	\$7,560
Group B, master's degree.....	6,530	6,785	7,040	7,295	7,550	7,805	8,060
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	6,730	6,985	7,240	7,495	7,750	8,005	8,260

"Salary class and position"	Service step 8	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13
Class 14:						
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	\$7,815	\$8,070	\$8,325	\$8,580	\$8,835	\$9,090
Group B, master's degree.....	8,315	8,570	8,825	9,080	9,335	9,590
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	8,515	8,770	9,025	9,280	9,535	9,790

"Salary class and position"	Service step 1	Service step 2	Service step 3	Service step 4	Service step 5	Service step 6	Service step 7	Service step 8
Class 15:								
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	\$5,000	\$5,260	\$5,520	\$5,735	\$5,950	\$6,165	\$6,380	\$6,595
Group B, master's degree.....	5,500	5,760	6,020	6,235	6,450	6,665	6,880	7,095
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	5,700	5,960	6,220	6,435	6,650	6,865	7,080	7,295
Attendance officer.....								
Census supervisor.....								
School psychologist.....								
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.....								
Instructor, teachers college.....								
Instructor, laboratory school.....								
Child labor inspector.....								
Counselor, placement.....								
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.....								
Librarian, teachers college.....								
Research assistant.....								
School social worker.....								
Speech correctionist.....								
Coordinator of practical nursing.....								
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.....								

"Salary class and position"	Service step 9	Service step 10	Service step 11	Service step 12	Service step 13	Longevity step X	Longevity step Y
Class 15:							
Group A, bachelor's degree.....	\$6,810	\$7,025	\$7,240	\$7,455	\$7,670	\$8,190	\$8,710
Group B, master's degree.....	7,310	7,525	7,740	7,955	8,170	8,690	9,210
Group C, master's degree plus 30 credit hours.....	7,510	7,725	7,940	8,155	8,370	8,890	9,410
Attendance officer.....							
Census supervisor.....							
School psychologist.....							
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.....							
Instructor, teachers college.....							
Instructor, laboratory school.....							
Child labor inspector.....							
Counselor, placement.....							
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.....							
Librarian, teachers college.....							
Research assistant.....							
School social worker.....							
Speech correctionist.....							
Coordinator of practical nursing.....							
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.....							

"(2) Section 2, subsection (a), is amended by striking from the third sentence 'December 31, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1962'; by striking from the fourth sentence the words 'counselor in the vocational high schools, counselor in the junior high schools', and the words 'school social workers,' and by inserting immediately before the period at the end of the same sentence the following: ', and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was appointed on probationary or permanent status before January 1, 1963, to a position as a nonshop teacher in a vocational education program, or counselor in the vocational high schools, or counselor in the junior high schools may continue to be employed in such a position, and except that a person not possessing a master's degree who was on the list of eligible candidates for any such position before January 1, 1963, may continue to be eligible for such position until the expiration of such eligible list'; and by striking from the fifth sentence 'December 31, 1957' and inserting in lieu thereof 'December 31, 1962'.

"(3) Section 2, subsection (b), is amended by striking the figure '18' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof the figure '15'.

"(4) Section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. Each teacher, school officer, or other employee in the service of the Board on January 1, 1963, who occupies a position held by him on December 31, 1962, under the provisions of this Act, shall be placed in a salary class covered by section 1 of this Act as indicated at the end of this section. Any employee in group A, B, or C of his salary class on December 31, 1962, shall be assigned to the same letter group of the salary class to which he is transferred on January 1, 1963.

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962

Title	Class
Superintendent.....	1
Deputy superintendent.....	2
Assistant superintendent.....	3

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962—Continued

Title	Class
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs.....	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	4
Chief examiner.....	5
Dean of students, teachers college.....	5
Executive assistant to the superintendent.....	5
Psychiatrist.....	5
Director, food services.....	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent.....	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools).....	6
Director, curriculum.....	4
Director, elementary education (administration).....	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).....	6
Director in elementary education.....	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.....	6
Director, industrial and adult education.....	5
Director, special education.....	7
Principal, senior high school.....	6
Principal, vocational high school.....	6
Principal, junior high school.....	7
Registrar, teachers college.....	7
Principal, Americanization School.....	7
Principal, junior high school.....	7
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools.....	8
Supervising director, athletics.....	8
Supervising director, curriculum.....	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).....	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget and legislation).....	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).....	7

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962—Continued

Title	Class
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study and attendance).....	8
Supervising director, reading clinic.....	8
Supervising director, subject field.....	8
Director, school attendance.....	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.....	9
Principal, elementary school.....	8
Principal, Capitol Page School.....	8
Principal, health school.....	7
Principal, laboratory school.....	7
Assistant principal, senior high school.....	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school.....	8
Assistant director, food services.....	9
Assistant principal, junior high school.....	9
Assistant principal, Americanization School.....	9
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	13
Assistant principal, elementary school.....	11
Assistant principal, health school.....	14
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction.....	13
Assistant director, evening and summer schools.....	11
Principal, veterans high school.....	8
Assistant director, practical nursing.....	18
Assistant director, subject field.....	13
Statistician.....	11
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	10
Assistant professor, laboratory school.....	16
Chief attendance officer.....	15
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	13
Clinical psychologist.....	15
Supervisor, elementary education.....	13
Psychiatric social worker.....	16
Attendance officer.....	18
Census supervisor.....	18
Child labor inspector.....	18
Coordinator, practical nursing.....	18
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.....	18
Counselor, placement.....	18

"Title and class of position on December 31, 1962—Continued

Title	Class
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	18
Instructor, laboratory schools.....	18
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.....	18
Librarian.....	18
Research assistant.....	18
School psychologist.....	18
School social worker.....	18
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	18
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.....	18

"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963

Title	Class
Superintendent.....	1
Deputy superintendent.....	2
Assistant superintendent.....	3
Assistant superintendent in charge of business affairs.....	3
President, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	3
Dean, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	4
Chief examiner.....	5
Dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	8
Executive assistant to the superintendent.....	5
Psychiatrist.....	5
Director, food services.....	5
Executive assistant to the deputy superintendent.....	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (elementary schools).....	6
Director, curriculum.....	4
Director, elementary education (administration).....	7
Director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).....	6
Director in elementary education.....	7
Director, health, physical education, athletics and safety.....	6
Director, industrial and adult education.....	5
Director, special education.....	7
Principal, senior high school.....	6
Principal, vocational high school.....	6
Principal, boys' junior-senior high school.....	6
Registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	8
Principal, Americanization School.....	6
Principal, junior high school.....	6
Professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	8
Supervising director, adult education and summer schools.....	8
Supervising director, athletics.....	8
Supervising director, curriculum.....	8
Supervising director, elementary education (supervision and instruction).....	8
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (general research, budget, and legislation).....	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (junior and senior high schools).....	6
Assistant to the assistant superintendent (pupil appraisal, study, and attendance).....	6
Supervising director, reading clinic.....	8
Supervising director, subject field.....	8
Director, school attendance.....	8
Supervising director, audio-visual instruction.....	9
Principal, elementary school.....	6
Principal, Capitol Page School.....	6
Principal, health school.....	6
Principal, laboratory school.....	6
Assistant principal, senior high school.....	8
Assistant principal, vocational high school.....	8
Assistant director, food services.....	9
Assistant principal, junior high school.....	8
Assistant principal, Americanization School.....	8

"Title and class of position on January 1, 1963—Continued

Title	Class
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	11
Assistant principal, elementary school.....	8
Assistant principal, health school.....	8
Assistant director, audio-visual instruction.....	11
Assistant director, evening and summer schools.....	10
Principal, veterans high school.....	6
Assistant director, practical nursing.....	11
Assistant director, subject field.....	11
Statistician.....	10
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	13
Assistant professor, laboratory school.....	13
Chief attendance officer.....	12
Chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	11
Clinical psychologist.....	12
Supervisor, elementary education.....	11
Psychiatric social worker.....	13
Attendance officer.....	15
Census supervisor.....	15
Child labor inspector.....	15
Coordinator, practical nursing.....	15
Counselor, elementary and secondary schools.....	15
Counselor, placement.....	15
Instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	15
Instructor, laboratory schools.....	15
Librarian, elementary and secondary schools.....	15
Librarian.....	15
Research assistant.....	15
School psychologist.....	15
School social worker.....	15
Speech correctionist, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	15
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools.....	15

"(5) Section 6, subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"(a) On January 1, 1963, each permanent employee assigned to salary classes 2 through 15 in accordance with section 1 and section 4 of this Act shall be assigned to the same numerical service step on the schedule for his salary class, or salary class and group, under this Act as he occupied on December 31, 1962, except that employees assigned to salary class 15 on January 1, 1963, who on December 31, 1962, were on service step 13 shall be assigned to service steps for their respective groups as follows: An employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed fifteen years of creditable service but less than eighteen years shall be assigned to longevity step X, and an employee who on January 1, 1963, has completed eighteen years of creditable service shall be assigned to longevity step Y. In determining years of creditable service for placement on service steps, credit shall be given for previous service in accordance with the provisions of this Act governing the placement of employees who are newly appointed, reappointed, or reassigned or who are brought under this Act in accordance with the provisions of section 5."

"(6) Section 6, subsection (b), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ', except that each employee in salary class 15 shall advance from service step 13 to longevity step X on July 1 following the completion of fifteen years of creditable service; from longevity step X to longevity step Y on July 1 following the completion of eighteen years of creditable service: *Provided*, That beginning with the step increase normally due July 1, 1963, the Board of Education, on the written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such salary advancement for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance

rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'

"(7) Section 7, subsection (a), is amended by striking the figure '18' both times it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '15', by striking the figure '17' and inserting in lieu thereof '14', and by striking the fourth sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'Employees newly appointed or reappointed to positions of assistant professor (salary class 13), chief librarian and associate professor (salary class 11), and professor (salary class 8) shall receive one year of placement credit for each year of satisfactory service, not in excess of five years, in a position of the same or higher rank in a college or university of recognized standing, outside the District of Columbia public schools, as determined by the Board.'

"(8) Section 8, subsection (a), is amended by striking the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: ', except that beginning with any such step increase normally due subsequent to June 30, 1963, the Board of Education, on written recommendation of the Superintendent of Schools, is authorized to deny any such increase in salary for the year immediately following any year in which the employee fails to receive a performance rating of "satisfactory" from his superior officer.'

"(9) Section 11, (1), is amended by inserting after the word 'increment' the words, 'or longevity increment'.

"(10) Section 13, subsection (a), is amended by striking the classification and pay rates for educational employees in the summer and evening schools and inserting in lieu thereof the following classification and pay rates:

"Classification	Step 1	Step 2	Step 3
Per Diem			
SUMMER SCHOOL (REGULAR)			
Teacher, elementary and secondary schools, and instructor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	\$19.72	\$21.69	\$23.66
Assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	22.68	24.94	27.21
Associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	25.64	28.20	30.76
Assistant principal, elementary and secondary schools, supervising director, and professor, District of Columbia Teachers College.....	28.59	31.45	34.31
Principal, elementary and secondary schools.....	28.59	31.45	34.31
Principal, elementary and secondary schools.....	31.55	34.70	37.86
Per Diem			
VETERANS' SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL CENTERS			
Teacher.....	\$29.58	\$32.54	\$35.49
Per Period			
EVENING SCHOOLS			
Teacher.....	\$5.04	\$5.39	\$5.79
Assistant principal.....	6.98	7.68	8.40
Principal.....	7.71	8.48	9.25

"(11) Section 13, subsection (b), is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'.

"(12) Section 14 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 14. Each employee assigned to salary class 15 in the schedule provided in section 1 of this Act, each assistant professor in salary class 13, each associate professor and chief librarian in salary class 11 and each professor in salary class 8 shall be classified as a teacher for payroll purposes and his annual salary shall be paid in ten

monthly installments in accordance with existing law.

"(13) Section 15 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 15. On and after January 1, 1963, the Act entitled 'An Act to provide that the Board of Education of the District of Columbia shall have sole authority to regulate the vacation periods and annual leave of absence of certain school officers and employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia', approved March 5, 1952, as amended, shall apply to employees of the Board of Education whose salaries are fixed in salary classes 6 through 14, inclusive, under this Act, except the following: Executive assistant to deputy superintendent and assistants to assistant superintendents in salary class 6; dean of students, District of Columbia Teachers College, professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, director, school attendance, and registrar, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 8; assistant director, department of food services, in salary class 9; statistician, in salary class 10; associate professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, and chief librarian, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 11; and assistant professor, District of Columbia Teachers College, in salary class 13."

"(14) Section 16 is amended by striking 'January 1, 1958' and inserting in lieu thereof 'January 1, 1963'; by striking 'salary class 18' and inserting in lieu thereof 'salary class 15'; by striking 'chief librarian and assistant professor, salary class 14' and inserting in lieu thereof 'assistant professor, salary class 13; and chief librarian, salary class 11'."

"SEC. 102. Section 2 of the Act entitled 'An Act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended', approved September 13, 1960 (74 Stat. 913), is repealed."

"SEC. 103. Sections 101 and 102 of this title shall take effect as of January 1, 1963." And the House agree to the same.

JOHN DOWDY,
BASIL WHITENER,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

WAYNE MORSE,
J. GLENN BEALL,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447), to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment strikes out all of title I of the Senate bill and inserts a substitute. The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the House with amendments to the House amendment. The differences between the Senate bill as amended by the House and the bill agreed to in conference are noted in the following outline, except for incidental changes made necessary by reason of the agreement reached by the conferees and minor and clarifying changes.

The conference action substitutes a new title I for both the House and the Senate versions, which in general follows the provisions of the House bill providing for an overall average increase of approximately 10 percent. Whereas the House amendment placed Senior High School Principals in Salary Class 6, Junior High School and several other principals in Class 7, and Elementary School Principals in Class 8, the conferees' amendment places all principals in Salary Class 6, as was the case in the original

Senate bill. A similar amendment by the conferees places all assistant principals in Salary Class 8, as the original Senate bill had provided, whereas the House amendment had distributed them into Classes 8, 9, and 10. Consistent with these changes, the conferees also placed the assistants to the several assistant superintendents in Salary Class 6. This also had been provided in the Senate bill, but in the House amendment thereto they were placed in Classes 6, 7, and 8.

The House amendment contained five position classifications in Salary Class 14. The conferees agreed to incorporate all these positions into Class 15, as had been provided in the Senate bill.

JOHN DOWDY,
BASIL WHITENER,
GEORGE HUDDLESTON, Jr.,
JOEL T. BROYHILL,
WILLIAM H. HARSHA,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOWDY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are the amendments in this bill germane?

Mr. DOWDY. I would like to say to the gentleman that the amendments made were negligible. We sustained 90 percent of the position of the House. They are all germane.

Mr. GROSS. All amendments to this bill are strictly germane to the subject matter of the bill as it passed the House. Is that correct?

Mr. DOWDY. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. GROSS. And what is the increase above the 10.1 percent that the House approved?

Mr. DOWDY. There is probably a very negligible increase, up to maybe 10.2 percent. I will state it this way. The House bill as we passed it was for \$2 million less than the Senate bill. The amendments perhaps will cost \$160,000.

Mr. GROSS. This bill deals only with teachers?

Mr. DOWDY. No one was added to the bill who was not in the House bill when it passed this body. That deals with principals, superintendents, and teachers. This is for the assistant superintendents and various professional grades.

Mr. GROSS. The District police are in another bill?

Mr. DOWDY. The police are in another bill.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOWDY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASED DEDUCTIONS FOR MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical and dental expenses and so forth, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amend-

ments, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I do this for the purpose of going over the Senate amendments with the gentleman as I have been doing heretofore. The basic bill as it passed the House liberalized the maximum dollar limitations on the amount of deductible medical expenses. The first amendment is a bill that passed the House.

Mr. MILLS. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The second amendment is one dealing with new election to deduct intangible drilling and development expenses. This is mostly procedural, and the gentleman has said that the conferees will explore it further. If that is what it is, I think it would conform at least to my concept in these procedural questions.

Third is occupational taxes paid by State liquor stores, which did pass the Ways and Means Committee and passed the House.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Fourth is restoration of amounts held under a claim of right. That looks to be purely procedural, and if it is procedural, that would be all right.

The fifth is very definitely procedural: authority of Internal Revenue criminal investigators to carry certain side arms. The next is definitely nongermane, and I assume the conferees will hold the line.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. This amendment was part of the Revenue Act of 1962 as it went to conference. It was eliminated from that bill.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Sixth is the exemption for bunker fuel.

Mr. MILLS. That was an amendment to another bill that went to conference and was eliminated. It is identical to language that I understand was eliminated in conference.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. But the bunker fuel item—

Mr. MILLS. That was already covered.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. By the House conferees?

Mr. MILLS. We were opposed to that on that occasion.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. 7 is a very simple proposition. That was attempted to be put in before and was knocked out by the conferees. It should be knocked out again.

Mr. MILLS. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. No. 8 is probably a conforming amendment, of course, but probably that could be done next year.

Mr. MILLS. It is conforming. I understand this conforms the tax to the Small Business Investment Act with the changes that were made by the Congress in that act this year. Very frankly, I admit it could be done next year.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. That is what I thought.

Under those circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I would not object to the matter going to conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. MILLS, KING of California, BOGGS, MASON, and BYRNES of Wisconsin.

AMENDING THE TRADING WITH THE ENEMY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 9045) to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That the last sentence of subsection (a) of section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1246; 50 U.S.C., App., sec. 39), is amended to read as follows: 'Nothing in this section shall be construed to repeal or otherwise affect the operation of section 32, 40, 41, 42, or 43 of this Act or of the Philippine Property Act of 1946.'

"Sec. 2. The Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following sections:

"Sec. 42. (a) As used in this section, the word 'trademarks' includes trademarks, trade names, and the goodwill of the business to which a trademark or trade name is appurtenant.

"(b) Trademarks vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, which have not been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act, except trademarks vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754, 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364), are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such trademarks shall on that day succeed to the rights, privileges, and obligations arising therefrom, subject, however, to the rights of licensees under licenses issued by the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General in respect to such trademarks. The rights and interests remaining in the Attorney General under licenses issued by him or by the Alien Property Custodian in respect to trademarks divested hereunder are hereby transferred, effective the day of divestment, to the persons entitled to such trademarks: *Provided*, That all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in favor of the Attorney General under such licenses prior to the day of divestment shall be paid by the licensees to the Attorney General.

"(c) All rights or interests vested in the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under the provisions of this Act subsequent to December 17, 1941, arising out of prevesting contracts entered into with respect to trademarks, except—

"(1) royalties or other income received by or accrued in favor of the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General under such contracts;

"(2) rights or interests which have been returned or otherwise disposed of under this Act; and

"(3) rights or interests vested by vesting orders 284, as amended (7 Fed. Reg. 9754; 9 Fed. Reg. 1038), 2354 (8 Fed. Reg. 14635), 5592 (11 Fed. Reg. 1675), and 18805 (17 Fed. Reg. 4364),

are hereby divested as a matter of grace, effective the ninety-first day after the date of enactment of this section, and the persons entitled to such rights or interests shall succeed thereto, subject to the right of the Attorney General to collect and receive all unpaid royalties or other income accrued in his favor under such prevesting contracts prior to the day of divestment.

"(d) The Attorney General shall within forty-five days after the date of enactment of this section publish in the Federal Register a list of trademarks which at the date of vesting in the Alien Property Custodian or Attorney General were owned by persons who were resident in or had their sole or primary seat in the area of Germany now in the Soviet Zone of Occupation or in the Soviet sector of Berlin or in German territory under provisional Soviet or Polish administration. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the effective date of divestment of the trademarks so listed and published in the Federal Register shall be the date of publication in the Federal Register by the Secretary of State of a certification identifying the cases in which an equivalent trademark has been registered in the Federal Republic of Germany for a person residing or having its sole or primary seat in the Federal Republic of Germany or in the western sectors of Berlin. In those cases of an equivalent trademark certified by the Secretary of State, the person registered by the Federal Republic of Germany as owner of such equivalent trademark shall succeed to the ownership of the divested trademark in the United States.

"Sec. 42. (a) The Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the Library of Congress the title to all prints of motion pictures now in the custody of the Library, which prints were vested in or transferred to the Alien Property Custodian or the Attorney General pursuant to this Act after December 17, 1941, except prints of motion pictures which are the subject of suits or claims under section 9(a) or section 32 of this Act.

"(b) Subject to the right of selection by the Library of Congress, the authorization, direction, and exception contained in subsection (a) hereof shall apply with respect to such prints now in the custody of the Attorney General. Prints not selected by the Library of Congress may be disposed of by the Attorney General in any manner he deems appropriate.

"(c) With respect to all prints concerning which title is transferred to the Library of Congress pursuant to subsections (a) and (b) hereof, the Library shall have complete discretion to retain such prints and to reproduce copies thereof, or to dispose of them in any manner it deems appropriate."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to explain the changes made by the Senate amendment in H.R. 9045.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to do so. It will be recalled this bill, H.R. 9045, was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on July 31 of this year. It was a unanimous report from the committee, and it was unanimously passed by the House of Representatives.

The bill, by way of reminding the House of the provisions of the bill, would divest a Government interest in copy-

rights, trademarks, and unexpired copyright contract interests.

The bill would authorize the transfer of all vested motion picture films and prints to the Library of Congress, and the Library in turn would be given the discretion to retain or dispose of such prints. This property was vested in the United States, as you will recall, under the Trading With the Enemy Act during or following World War II.

The bill terminates administration by the Attorney General of the property described. In the absence of legislation, the administration setup would continue indefinitely.

As the bill passed the House on August 13, 1962, it would accomplish the purposes just briefly explained.

The Senate inadvertently included only one-half of the bill; that is, that portion dealing with copyrights, when they consolidated it with the War Claims and Trading With the Enemy measure into one omnibus bill, you will recall, H.R. 7283. That bill, H.R. 7283, has been agreed to and finally passed, and is now awaiting the signature of the President.

Yesterday, the other body having discovered the inadvertence of leaving out part of the provisions of the bill, called it up and amended this bill, H.R. 9045, to include the other half of the bill that they had left out.

What this does is approve that part of the bill having to do with trademarks as the copyright provision contained in the bill passed a few days ago.

This completes the program.

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPECTED SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that the leadership is making every possible effort to reach sine die adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that all Members will remain in Washington and at the Capitol until we have disposed of the necessary legislative business. The lack of a quorum, of course, could delay adjournment. It is therefore very, very important that the Members stay here until a sine die adjournment resolution has been agreed to.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. We are all delighted, of course, to hear that the leadership is

driving for adjournment. But the gentleman from Oklahoma did not say at what time they are driving for adjournment. Is the gentleman anticipating that that might occur today yet?

Mr. ALBERT. I will not rule that out, but I certainly am most anxious that we adjourn the Congress before the end of the week.

Mr. AVERY. If the gentleman will yield further, I can assure the gentleman of the support of everyone on this side of the aisle on that subject.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. Would the majority leader say that it is now the intention of the leadership that it is pressing with every effort to try to get out tonight?

Mr. ALBERT. We shall try to get out tonight, if we can resolve certain matters which have to be resolved. We have to get conference reports up by unanimous consent. That would be one of the contingencies.

Mr. BASS of Tennessee. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to say to the distinguished majority leader that I have every confidence in his great ability as an outstanding and strong leader. With the help of the distinguished Speaker, I am sure that the gentleman from Iowa will allow these conference reports to come up by unanimous consent, as the gentleman said, if the gentleman had some time in which to study them before they came up. I really believe that with all of this co-operation on the part of everyone we can get out of here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT].

Mr. ALBERT. I will say to the gentleman from Tennessee that I hope he has the same confidence in other Members of this body and the other body and that the gentleman's confidence is well founded.

ADJOURNMENT BY THE WEEKEND?

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to ask the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] if the problems of the House remain in status quo for today and tomorrow, will we adjourn without taking the bills which are in conference?

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, as the gentlewoman from New York knows, there are outstanding appropriation bills on which action must be had prior to adjournment. It is hoped that action can be had on all of the bills that are now in conference, and it is expected that action will be had.

EMERGENCY OFFICER'S RETIREMENT BENEFITS

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 8517) to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 11, insert:

"The limitations of time contained in section 1905 of title 38, United States Code, are hereby waived in favor of Walter J. Johnson (Veterans' Administration claim numbered C-6048500), and his application for benefits under chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, shall be acted upon under the remaining provisions of such chapter if he applies for such benefits within the six-month period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is only one Senate amendment to this bill?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. There is only one Senate amendment.

Mr. GROSS. And, it is strictly germane; is that correct?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. It is not germane.

Mr. GROSS. Well, then, I think we had better have an explanation of the Senate amendment.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I shall be glad to give the gentleman an explanation.

Mr. Speaker, the basic bill is a veterans bill that passed by a unanimous-consent request. There is no money involved. The amendment of the Senate is really a bill which came from the Judiciary Committee which gives a veteran who lost his hand in World War II \$1,600. It was passed by the Committee on the Judiciary as a private bill. It went to the other body and they attached it to our veterans bill. This bill has been cleared with the Committee on the Judiciary, on the minority and majority sides, the leadership on both sides, and by Mr. CURTIS, I hope.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I do not know why my name was brought in. It was not cleared with me, but I am very happy to have this procedure followed when there are non-germane amendments, that they be explained; and if they are explained in this fashion I, myself, would have no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should like to say that this was cleared with the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH] a member of the subcommittee, and by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF], who is the ranking member and who is now present.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE NEXT PRESIDENT AFTER PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a pledge. If we get out of here tonight, at the end of the second Kennedy administration I am going to flip a coin for the next President of the United States to succeed President Kennedy. On one side of the coin will be our beloved Speaker; on the other side our beloved majority leader. If working together they will get us out of here tonight, either McCORMACK or ALBERT, the flip of the coin deciding, is entitled to be the next President of the United States following the second Kennedy administration.

KNOWLES DAM PROJECT

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, October 10, my colleague, the gentleman from Montana, the Honorable ARNOLD OLSEN, from the First Congressional District, made a statement on the floor of the House to the effect that since news of the inclusion of the Knowles project in the proposed 1963 public works bill that he had received over 200 telegrams in favor of the project and none against. He inserted in the RECORD those telegrams.

So that the House may know that the question of the construction of Knowles Dam in Montana is a most highly controversial issue in that State, and that there are people in the State of Montana who oppose this project, I should like to give the House the benefit of the communications I have had upon this subject. First let me state that my mail would indicate that this issue is one of the most important to Montanans during my term in Congress. The Knowles project is not in my district. However, because of the intense interest of the State of Montana in this project, I feel it my duty to set the record straight with respect to the feeling of the people of Montana about this project.

To date, I have received in my office 774 letters on the subject of the Knowles project. While a few of these letters are from out of the State of Montana, 97 percent are an expression from within

Montana. Thirty-one of the communications indicated they favored the construction of Knowles Dam. Seven hundred forty-one of the communications expressed vigorous objections to the project, and two letters merely requested information on Knowles. Many of the opposing communications were signed by as many as 200 people. The bulk of the correspondence indicates a real and sincere concern about the wisdom of the construction of this project.

In addition, I have received many resolutions from various organizations in the area affected by this project and throughout Montana, which I think is of interest to the House.

The organizations which have indicated to me by resolution that they favor the Knowles project are as follows:

Cascade County Trades & Labor Assembly.

Board of Trustees of Mid-Yellowstone Electric Cooperative, Hysham, Mont.

South Valley County Farmers Union. Montana Council of Cooperatives.

Yellowstone Valley Cooperative, Huntley, Mont.

Montana State AFL-CIO.

Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, Sun River Lodge No. 456.

The organizations which have indicated their opposition to the Knowles project by resolution sent to me are:

County Commissioners of Lake County, Mont.

Polson, Mont., Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Polson Chamber of Commerce.

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation.

Western Montana Citizens Committee. Montana State Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Ravalli County Farm Bureau.

Kalispell Chamber of Commerce.

Montana Fish and Game Commission.

Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Local No. 652.

Western Montana Stockmen's Association.

Camas Prairie Grange.

Montana Farm Bureau.

Montana Reclamation Association.

Montana Water Users' Association.

Flathead Lakers' Inc., a nonprofit corporation of approximately 800 members and taxpayers of Lake and Flathead Counties, Mont.

Little Bitterroot Landowners' Association.

The Affiliated Tribes of the Northwest.

Flathead Sweet Cherry Growers' Association.

Jocko Valley Irrigation District.

Flathead Irrigation District.

Mission Irrigation District, St. Ignatius, Mont.

Montana Stockgrowers Association.

Montana Wildlife Federation.

Montana Bankers Association.

Montana Chamber of Commerce.

Paradise Parent Teachers Association.

Montana State Water Conservation Board.

Western Montana Fish & Game Association.

Eastshoremens, Inc., Bigfork, Mont.

City Council of Ronan, Mont.

Ronan Area Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Western Montana Beetgrowers' Association.

Round Butte Grange.

Montana Electrical Contractors' Association.

Elmo Electric Cooperative Association, Inc.

Montana Inter-Tribal Policy Board.

Polson Indian Livestock Association.

Dixon Indian Livestock Association.

Mission Range Stock Association.

Valley Creek Indian Livestock Association.

Rosebud-Treasure Wildlife Association, Hysham, Mont.

Jocko Stock Association.

Bozeman Chamber of Commerce, Bozeman, Mont.

Hobson Women's Club, Hobson, Mont.

Plains Grange No. 101.

Hoo-Hoo Club—Fraternal Order of Lumbermen, Missoula, Mont.

Leon Grange No. 131 of St. Ignatius, Mont.

Montana County Commissioners Association, District No. 8.

School District No. 8 of Sanders County.

Polson Valley Grange No. 144, Polson, Mont.

Malta Chamber of Commerce, Malta, Mont.

Malta Irrigation District.

Glasgow Irrigation District.

City Council of Polson, Mont.

LaSalle Grange of Flathead County, Mont.

Townsend Chamber of Commerce, Townsend, Mont.

Indian Rights Association, Philadelphia, Pa.

Miles City Chamber of Commerce, Miles City, Mont.

Nyah Grange No. 133, Hot Springs, Mont.

Ronan Chamber of Commerce, Ronan, Mont.

Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, Kalispell, Mont.

Montana Wood Products Association.

Every Governor of the State of Montana, since this project was first proposed, has strongly indicated the opposition of the State of Montana to the project. Those Governors are: the late Gov. Sam C. Ford, Gov. John W. Bonner, Gov. J. Hugo Aronson, the late Gov. Donald G. Nutter, and the present Gov. Tim Babcock.

It is evident to me that the people of Montana and the area to be affected by this project are overwhelmingly against it. It is certainly not a project which should be included in any rivers and harbors bill before it has had thorough hearings in the Public Works Committee or the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives.

It would appear to me that there is a serious jurisdictional question that the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives has the authority to authorize this project, since it is to be built and maintained by the Bureau of Reclamation. The jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation rests with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee

of the House. Additionally, there are serious problems involving the treaty rights of the Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation in which power sites which would be flooded by the Knowles project were specifically reserved to the tribes. This is a subject which also falls within the jurisdiction of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

My distinguished colleague in his statement to the House said that the Knowles project will irrigate more than 21,000 acres. The feasibility study of the Corps of Army Engineers shows absolutely no irrigation benefits from this project. In recent Senate hearings Mr. Holum, Assistant Secretary for Water and Power Development of the Department of the Interior, indicated that the Bureau of Reclamation had not made a feasibility study of this project. So that to say that this project would irrigate some 21,000 acres of land simply is not substantiated by the studies so far made on the project. One thing is certain, however, this project inundates 59,000 acres of Montana land in two counties. It floods over 9,500 acres of good, fertile, highly productive irrigated land now in production. It displaces over 1,300 residents of Montana who must seek new homes and new opportunities to make a livelihood.

Mr. Speaker, I must take issue with my good friend and colleague, Mr. OLSEN, and urge the conferees of the public works bill to reject the Knowles project until the people of Montana have had an opportunity to present their views on this subject to a proper committee of the House of Representatives. To date, they have not been accorded that opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks two petitions which I have received from the area directly affected by this project, signed by over 265 people indicating their strenuous opposition to this project:

Hearings held in this area in the past on the Knowles-Paradise Dam project prove that the opponents of this project are in the majority 3 to 1. We are opposed to the inclusion of the Knowles Dam project in the rivers and harbors omnibus bill without first conducting a public hearing on this project in this area.

O. J. Murphy, Paradise; H. G. Sears, Paradise; E. L. Sears, Paradise; B. K. Ekinan, Paradise; W. E. Meredith, Plains; H. C. Mathies, Paradise; Charles E. Porter, Paradise; Arthur Fortner, Paradise; H. W. Pickering, Paradise; R. A. Delus, Plains; Fay D. Sears, Paradise; E. O. Willcutt, Paradise; F. R. Minear, Paradise; E. W. Farrington, Plains; H. D. Wagenius, Paradise; C. E. Herman, Paradise.

Agnes L. Ogden, Paradise; Robert Connell, Paradise; Alice P. Calder, Paradise; L. E. Howry, Paradise; Henry H. Bartsch, Paradise; Robert A. Kangas, Paradise; Mrs. Robert Kangas, Paradise; Kathryn Andair, Paradise; Sally L. Sears, Paradise; Agnes H. Minear, Paradise; Gerald Hobson, Paradise; W. A. Parrish, Paradise; Donna J. Barber, Paradise; Olaf Z. Dirksen, Paradise; Mrs. Olaf Dirksen, Paradise; J. W. Kurn, Paradise; E. E. Day, Paradise; Maxine V. Pickering, Paradise; Mrs. C. L. Willcutt, Paradise; C. L. Willcutt, Paradise; Mrs. Art Fortner, Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Porter, Jr., Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. Victor L. Cyr, Paradise; Mrs.

Robert E. Stephens, Paradise; Nellie J. Petersen, Paradise; Mrs. Karen K. Brox, Plains.

W. N. Brox, Plains; R. H. Jacobson, Hot Springs; Essie Sanks, Paradise; Robert E. Stephens, Paradise; Sally Stephens, Paradise; Roscoe Henderson, Paradise; Jean Mathies, Paradise; Mr. and Mrs. Jerry Colyer, Paradise; Robt. L. Nunch, Paradise; Steve V. Malmberg, Paradise; Chas. C. Bowser, Paradise; Clara M. Bowser, Paradise; H. A. McMichael, Paradise; Sylvia McMichael, Paradise; Mrs. O. J. Murphy, Paradise; Bertha B. Gingery, Perma; Mrs. Marie A. Ardes, Perma; June Marie Acenedo, Perma; H. H. Burgess, Perma; L. M. Burgess, Perma; John B. Adams, Perma; Mrs. W. E. Phillips, Perma; Mr. W. E. Phillips, Perma; Rita Knerr, Perma; Lottie Cummings, Perma.

Archie M. Knerr, Perma; Molly Mogus, Perma; N. J. Mogus, Perma; James A. Holland, Perma; Marriel Marriman, Perma; Jack Marriman, Perma; Anna Marriman, Perma; Virginia Erchnl, Perma; Mrs. Betty Jo Holland, Perma; Hal Pelley, Perma; R. J. Holland, Perma; Nell M. Holland, Perma; J. P. Holland, Perma; Joseph P. Erchnl, Perma; Mabel E. Webber, Perma; H. S. Webber, Perma; Ruth Helming, Perma; Grover Helming, Perma; Edna Rice, Perma; Ruth Jorgenson, Perma; Harold Lorass, Perma; Arthur Harper, Perma; John Stanislax, Perma; Lillie Harper, Perma; Allen Lorass, Perma; Virgil L. Pitts, Perma.

Loretta Pelley, Perma; Mary Cross, Perma; Sid Cross, Perma; Bernice Rost, Perma; Irene Ulviek, Perma; Mrs. E. Bulger, Perma; Emmett Bulger, Perma; Marie Muster, Perma; Andrew Burgess, Perma; Gloria Burgess, Perma; Lella McClary, Perma; Therese M. Holland, Perma; Thomas J. Holland, Perma; Joe M. Erchrel, Perma; Beverly Erchrel, Perma; Joe Klawitter, Perma; Mary Nell Klawitter, Perma; Lella A. Kelly, Plains; Dan S. Kelly, Plains; Ruby E. Goodrich, Plains; Marie Coe, Plains; Yvonne Tompkins, Plains; May Knox, Plains; Columbia Kahtel, Plains; J. Norman Coe, Plains; H. L. Doty, Plains.

Jean C. Doty, Plains; Gloria Mainwaring, St. Regis; C. B. Kelly, Plains; Jeanette H. Smith, Plains; Lillie A. Kennedy, Plains; Harvey Baber, Hot Springs; J. Pilley, Perma; B. W. Howard, Perma; Wm. J. Buck, Perma; Lee Rost, Perma; Doris D. Pelley, Perma; James P. Pelley, Perma; Paul Argo, Perma; Rose Ellen Argo, Perma; Bessie Argo, Perma; Arthur Argo, Perma.

Edgar Walter, Perma; Gladys Sipes, Perma; Ray Jorgenson, Perma; Ross Bartlett, Perma; Jessie L. Bartlett, Perma; Donald E. Rice, Perma; Donald L. Ross, Perma; Arlene J. Ross, Perma; Robert L. Pelley, Perma; Bertha Pelley, Perma; Jimmie Balsert, Plains; Robert S. Loder, Plains; Lester A. Gingery, Paradise; Wendell Stephens, Paradise; Helen Stephens, Paradise; Preston Nayer, Paradise; Marlin Stephens, Paradise; Edward Hermes, Paradise; Elizabeth V. Hermes, Paradise; Bess Van Derlsoff, Paradise; Merl Shrader, Paradise; Ann Crandall, Paradise; Ruby McDonald, Paradise; Warren Ardis, Paradise; Jess Cook, Paradise.

We, the people of this area, are worried about your actions with respect to the proposed Knowles-Paradise Dam on the Clark's Fork of the Columbia River in western Montana.

Included in a pork-barrel appropriation measure, now before you for consideration, are funds for the construction of Knowles Dam which the politicians seem determined to build in spite of our continued protests to the contrary.

The tax bite from the people of the United States for this monstrosity will be \$688 million over a period of 50 years.

Our concern and our question is: "Would you, as an elected representative of the people of this country, have the audacity to sit up in the Congress of the United States and vote for a gouge of this magnitude when practically the same output of power can be

produced by private enterprise on two Indian-owned sites nearby on this same river for one-tenth of the cost, and at the same time preserve the economy of the area as well as protect the treaty rights of the Indians, who, under the Knowles proposal, would be flooded out and lose a potential income of \$15 million during the next 50 years?"

It is high time for some serious thinking in high places with respect to the throwing around of public funds.

Respectfully,

Polson Junior Chamber of Commerce, board of directors and members: Clinton Johhete, president; Dr. John W. Frazier, executive vice president; Donald G. Lucas, board of directors, State chairman Americanism and governmental affairs; John Nelson, international vice president; Loren J. Master, treasurer; Phillip Zanzick.

Polson Chamber of Commerce, board of directors and members: Paul H. Friedberg, president, editor, Flathead Courier; Ole Beland, secretary, chamber of commerce; C. Wayne Mahugh, vice president, chamber of commerce, Mahugh Food Sales; Ceula W. Donovan, treasurer, Polson Chamber of Commerce, D. & D. Shoe Mart; M. E. Bailey, director of Polson Chamber of Commerce; John D. Davis, director of Polson COPE; Hu Black, Gamble Store.

Arle Johnson, Betty Zimmer, Tower & Robinson by Elmer W. Robinson; Maynard Nixon, Edna Wesker (Edna's Tall 'n Teen); Ray L. Nunnally, Leonard Aewgood, Thelma Hann, Ralph D. Davis, J. L. Brusletter, Keith A. Johnson, executive vice president, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; G. Ellenwood Sr., mayor of Polson, Mont.; Ronald Oldis, city council, Polson, Mont.; Ralph Maxwell, George Davis, Jr., commissioner Lake County; H. M. Hendrickson, commissioner Lake County; Hazel Kinnick, Marian De Saussure, Don Butler, Lake County treasurer; Muriel Hamman, Lake County superintendent; Charles W. Reynolds, Lake County assessor; Bill Gigham, Lake County sheriff; J. A. Inmage, Lake County attorney; Giana A. Wilson, M. E. Pinkney, Eddies Drug, Leland J. Newgard, public accountant, Polson, Mont.; J. E. Burlingame, Polson, Mont.; Ruthe A. Olsen, Gladys Frantz, Polson, Mont.; Irene Fite, Stan Davies, Homer G. Murphy, Gene Hamman, public accountant, Polson, Mont.; Ralph Fite, Polson, Mont.; Pauline M. Manning, Doris A. Webb, Laurence M. Strauss, Smoke House, C. E. Sufist, Elliot M. Johnson, Walter E. Maddy, Smith Electric.

Lyman Claridge Logging Co., Polson, Mont.; Lyman Claridge, Tastee Freez, Aurthur E. Robinson; Thomas E. Nenda, E. E. Eunke, J. H. Hanson, president, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; W. L. Rader, Polson, Mont.; Norm T. Johnson, city councilman, Security State Bank, Polson, Mont.; Lloyd I. Wassace, Irene M. Pronovost; Helmer Harris Chevrolet Co., A. R. Helmer, president, Polson, Mont.; Amy V. Howel, rancher, Polson, Mont.; A. E. Crawford, Polson, Mont.; C. L. Sterling, blacksmith, Polson, Mont.; Jerry C. Paul, wardrobe cleaner; Vesnou Utsovd, locker operator; Mary Ann Mastad, Valley Furniture Center; Harold T. Korloqodti, Korloqodti Agency; Betty J. Shime, secretary, Katesgodt's Agency; Mabel Fralin, H. Everett Smith, J. R. Grinde, Helen M. Lewis, Roberts Morse, Frances Dehne, Marilyn Jensen, Lucy Wills, Chorline Warren, Janet L. Keller, Thelma Herman, Evelyn Peters, Maxine J. Gilbert, Jean K. Welch, June Maynard, Dora H. Thibert, Danesed F. Redman, Esther V. Buzzard, Lois K. Farnsmann; John Nelson, Polson, Mont., pharmacist; Otis W. Nelson, Diana M. Nelson, Luella S. Smith, N. B. Coppedge, Ruth I. Coppedge; Sheneman's Mens Wear, R. E. Sheneman; Carl's Union Service, Polson, Mont.; Brown's Jewelry Store, Dr. S. Brown, J. L. Brown; Emmett C. Hinst, D. & H. Food Mart; Jim Duford, D. & H. Food Mart; O. R. Hinst, Polson Plumbing & Heating; William A. Coyers, barber; Calvin Hubbard, Hubbard's Phar-

macy, Inc.; Walter Davis, Work Board, Flathead Lake; Lowell M. Berison, outfitter, 2 Box B; Donald G. Lucas, L. & F. Tire Co.; Paul C. Lane, electrical maintenance; V. P. Powell, Marjorie Smith.

SPEAKER JOHN W. McCORMACK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, it appears that the work of this session of the Congress is nearing its end. Judging by the comments that I have heard on the floor for the last several days I think most Members on both sides of the aisle will be quite happy when that adjournment will arrive. I personally hope that that may occur tonight or tomorrow at the latest. But I do not want this session to close without taking a minute or two to pay tribute to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, of Massachusetts.

I think all of us will look back at this session of Congress and call it a constructive session of Congress. I know that there have been disagreements, that we fought some battles here, many of which have been resolved on the basis of just a few votes. But I think all of us will agree that Speaker JOHN McCORMACK has presided over this body with fairness, and with a sense of the great purpose of the House of Representatives. He has carried on the magnificent tradition of Speaker Rayburn; namely, that there is no body on earth comparable to this legislative body, the House of Representatives of the United States.

I think all of the people of the United States are indebted to him for having upheld and carried on that great tradition. Of course, all of us, Mr. Speaker, who have had the pleasure of working with you for many years have not been surprised in the slightest. You were a great party leader and I am certain that no one would say that you did not discharge those responsibilities with vigor. But by the same token you have discharged the responsibilities of the office of Speaker with fine, impartial, non-partisan fairness, and this, I think the gentlemen on my left will agree, has been so throughout this session.

So as we go home, Mr. Speaker, I think I express the sentiments of all of us in wishing you well and in hoping that you have a well-earned and a well-deserved rest. I think I speak for all of us on this side when I say that when the Congress reconvenes in January, the 88th Congress will be presided over by the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, as Speaker.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, of course I speak only for myself, but I think most of us on this side of the aisle would agree with the comments made by our friend from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs], at least with respect to the fairness of the Speaker and the diligence with which he has discharged his duties. I want the RECORD to show now that when we elect the gentleman from Indiana, CHARLIE HALLECK, as the next Speaker of the House it is not a personal matter but just a matter of principle upon which we are divided.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair say that he appreciates very much the statements of friendship just made by his colleagues.

RUSSIAN ORGANIZATION CONTROL ACT

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which may be referred to as the "Russian Organization Control Act." It has been perfected with the help and coordination of many interested parties. It is so simple and timely that I am submitting it even at this late date of the session so that the members of the committee to which it is referred can study it and familiarize themselves with it in event we adjourn in this calendar year. Otherwise, it will be resubmitted early in the next session.

Mr. Speaker, the failure of the Communist Party to register under the 1950 act, as interpreted by the Supreme Court, in fact, outlaws that organization. These laws and the ruling of the Supreme Court are not being enforced. The Department of Justice says the Communist agents in this country are ineffective. Other responsible people relate that the Russian servants are deeply infiltrated in every walk of American life. It is my personal opinion that they succeed in confusing U.S. issues to the extent that it is difficult for us to make rational decisions in foreign affairs. Certainly we are in an era of defeatism, fear, and lack of firm unity in this country. This law would constitute a legislative check on the power of the Attorney General and cause grand juries to investigate enforcement in their districts. I see how no one could oppose this bill.

I have no pride in authorship, but am anxious to get on with the job, and would hope that the committee chairman, Members and my colleagues in this House will read it, investigate it, improve it, and adopt it at the earliest possible date. It has been too long since the Supreme Court decision and the date of implementation thereof with only two indictments to date in an admitted Communist Party in the United States of America of over 10,000 members. Technically, it might be said that existing law requires registration only until the party and its members defied the Supreme Court verification which outlawed

them; but this bill will outlaw both by amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950—50 U.S.C. 781.

Mr. Speaker, the bill may be summarized as follows:

Section 2: Specific congressional findings are made with respect to events since 1950 and present necessity.

Section 3: The Attorney General or any district attorney may apply to the district court for an injunction against any organization while Board proceedings are pending.

Section 4: Orders of the Subversive Activities Board to register are enforceable after 30 days unless stayed by the majority of an appellate court. Presently one judge or justice can grant such a stay. This practice lets Russia string out interminably the finality of Board orders and a new provision would make such delay far more difficult.

Section 5: This is in three parts: 14A amended provides for grand jury examination of the Attorney General or his designated assistant to inquire into his enforcement of this act in the district and for grand jury petition to Congress if dissatisfied with his diligence. This calls on Congress to investigate the enforcement and contains impeachment proceedings. This might force the Attorney General's hand. In any event it would keep the Congress informed and it would give the people some hand in opposing Russia. If it does not work, the special district attorney provisions can be put into effect in a later act. Subsection 14B: Absolute priority of trials is provided for. This is badly needed to combat delay. Subsection 14C: Violations of the 1950 act are pinpointed as violations against the law of nations. The Constitution gives the Congress specific power to "define and punish offenses against the law of nations," article I, section 8, chapter 10. A good case on the point is *United States v. Rodriguez* (California, 1960), 182 Fed. Supp. 479, and other cases are found at 339 U.S. 382, 187 Fed. 2d 991 at 997, affirmed 342 U.S. 524. The Litvinov 1930 agreement between Russia and the United States, which has the effect of a treaty, provided that on recognition of the Soviet Union, Russia would disband her organization in this country, which she has not done and she and the members of that organization have committed and still commit offenses against the law of nations under that agreement, which Congress specifically has the power to "define and punish."

Section 6: Direct and immediate employees of Congress, the President, and the Supreme Court, who violate the act henceforth, may be given the death penalty. This is because they operate at the core of Government which is more dangerous to us even than operations in the Army and in defense facilities.

Section 7: This is in two parts: Subsection 15A of the act as amended provides for the denial of bail after conviction in the trial court and particularly where Russia or one of her Communist agents is furnishing the bail. The objection to the denial of bail before conviction is cured. This provision is badly needed as witness the flights of Eisler, Soblen—convicted under the Espionage Act—and others. Presently, Russia

merely pays a ransom in the form of "bail," for those she wants. Subsection 15B of the act as amended provides for power in the superintendents of penitentiaries to keep convicts under the act from carrying on their work in the organization while in prison.

Section 8 is a technical section providing that conflict with prior laws shall be resolved in favor of this law and that if any part of this act should be unconstitutional, the rest of it should be constitutional.

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VANIK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, before this session adjourns, I feel impelled to direct the attention of the House to circumstances and conditions which are detracting from the national good and prosperity.

When President Kennedy took office in January 1961, the gross national product stood at the annual rate of \$500 billion; personal income was at the annual rate of \$403½ billion; corporate income was at the annual rate of \$39.8 billion. Over 6 million persons were unemployed of a total work force of 70 million or at a rate of 6.7 percent. According to most economists and business forecasters, the country was headed for a recession in the spring of 1961, apparently scheduled to begin the cold day of President Kennedy's inauguration.

The year 1961 ended up as a record-breaker. The GNP soared to \$538 billion, unemployment soared to 70.6 million, the stock market was hitting the ceiling with the Dow Jones average hitting 728.44, and price levels were being maintained.

When President Kennedy decided to resist the steel price increase proposed by a price-fixing deal arranged by big steel, he was charged with destroying the historical privilege of the steel industry to "rig" prices upward on an industrywide basis.

The business community shivered and trembled at the President's reaction to their scheme, but they did not raise their prices. If big steel was right and the President wrong, as they contended, why did not they hold their ground and prove their case? The same courts which could try them for price fixing and conspiracy in restraint of trade, could also try the President for arbitrary abuse of executive authority. The question is now moot, but which side would have prevailed in the courts under our Constitution, the President or big steel?

The discovered avarice and spattered pride of big steel plunged it and its industrial cohorts to show the President a lesson. Almost immediately the stock market quivered. Dow-Jones and the other services advised their customers and thousands of nonsubscribers who did not solicit this advice to get themselves in a more substantial cash position and out of the market. Those steel companies which threatened action independent of big steel headed the prepared lists of stocks made prime

candidates for sale. The selling began on "Black Monday," May 28, 1962. The selloff plunged the Dow-Jones averages 150 points. Timid, credit-heavy buyers were washed out. Recession talk was in the air.

Recession talk became the incendiary ammunition of those who despised the President's determination to hold the price line. The President is the enemy of business, they said. Enemy of business? Who provided the industrial and business community with the best lures and windfalls of this generation? In 1954, under Mr. Eisenhower, business got tremendous tax bonanzas in the Revenue Act of 1954. During the Korean war, certain war industries got advantages in the quick tax write-off. But look what this antibusiness President was doing for business. Early this summer the Treasury issued a revised depreciation schedule which increases corporate profits and Treasury losses by a billion and one-half this year and \$14 billion over the next 10 years. On top of this, the Kennedy administration presented hostile business with a 7-percent investment credit which should raise corporate income and reduce Treasury collections over \$1 billion this year and \$16 billion over the next 10 years. If President Eisenhower had tried to do as much for American business, the Members on my side of the aisle would have cried for his impeachment. What does business want—an abolition of all taxes?

The fact of the matter is that there is nothing that President Kennedy can do to please that portion of the business community which elects to remain in rebellion with the Government.

Today, the stock market is solely a barometer of the gambling urge. Stock prices bear no more ratio to earnings and liquid value than a parimutuel ticket does to the trading value of a horse. The stock market today is a national lottery and ought to be taxed as one. When prices hit bottom, the smart guys bought what the timid fellows sold. Right now, many corporations are buying up their own stock for future stock-option giveaways to their own executives.

The fact of the matter is that we are no closer to a recession today than we were last year or the year before. We are only as close as the American people can be led to believe we are. The chronic and constant talk of recession is the organized claptrap of the Madison Avenue crowd who are conspiring to mess up the program of President Kennedy. His failure would be their frenzied delight, but he will not fail.

Today, after 21 months of the Kennedy administration, we see that the GNP has risen over 10 percent to \$552 billion; personal income has risen over 10 percent to \$443 billion; corporate income has risen over 27 percent to almost 51 billion. Factory profits have risen 15 percent over last year. Unemployment has been reduced 58 percent from 6 million to 3.5 million in a work force which has grown to 72.2 million. September witnessed an unprecedented jab at unemployment. Inventories are low. Retail stores report an unseasonal increase in sales. The 1963 model automobiles are inviting brisk interest.

Housing starts have broken all records. Residential housing at year end promises to be \$3 to \$4 billion or 25 percent over last year.

Does this look like recession? Who and where are the prophets of doom and gloom? Wall Street and Madison Avenue are neck deep in the quicksands of politics. The income tax laws are the target. The main assault is planned early next year. If this recession comes, it will be the first one in history foisted on us by the Madison Avenue gloom-makers who find it profitable to sell America short.

Take a look at the 1963 model, try it and buy it. It is the best automobile you have ever owned, and it is made in America. If you need it, buy your new house—that new furniture, and get yourself a new suit today. The price is right. The bargains next year are bound to be more scarce.

The big bad wolves have been planning a little recession—but I think President Kennedy is outfoxing them.

THE HONORABLE JOHN R. RAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. George] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, this is the time of the year, which we devoutly hope will be the closing days of this session of Congress, when we take leave of some of our colleagues.

Sometimes this leave is involuntary. But there are cases where a friend and colleague of many years decides to retire voluntarily.

This is the case of the gentleman to whom I wish to pay tribute today. JOHN H. RAY has represented the 15th Congressional District of New York State since being elected to the 83d Congress in November of 1952.

During these years he has represented his district faithfully and with diligence. He has also represented the best principles and philosophy of the Republican Party.

JOHN RAY has had a brilliant career in the law and has served his country and his community in peace and war—at home and abroad.

I am reasonably sure that when he decided to come to Congress he decided to do so because he wanted once more to serve his people and his country.

We of the New York delegation are proud of JOHN RAY. We regret to see him retire. We shall miss his companionship and his example. But we wish him well in the years ahead in whatever he undertakes. And may these years ahead be happily shared by his wife and family.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER].

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the New York delegation, I want to associate myself with everything my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mrs. St. George], has just said about the retirement of our colleague JOHN RAY.

Some of us have been very closely associated with him both on the floor of the House and off, but I think for many of us one of our outstanding associations with him was in the Wednesday morning breakfasts. During all those meetings we were wisely entertained and guided by the gentleman from New York, JOHN RAY.

As our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George], has said, the end of the session is always tinged somewhat with sadness because we know that some will not return to be with us. I, for one, want to say, and I know the New York delegation feels likewise, that the Members of the House will miss their association with JOHN RAY. They wish for him and his good wife many, many years of good health and happiness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN].

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a very happy occasion for me to speak for a few moments about one of our colleagues who will be leaving us at the end of this year.

JOHN RAY was born in the great Midwest, in Minnesota, and just a few weeks ago was 76 years young. He got his B.A. degree at the University of Minnesota. He then went to Harvard but he did not turn left. He was admitted to the Minnesota Bar in 1912, and later became vice president and general counsel of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. in 1942, from which position he had to retire under the mandatory age limit in 1951.

It was then this youngster of 66 decided to run for Congress. He has been reelected five times. He has served his constituents honorably, with diligence, and is the epitome of wisdom, in my opinion. I have never heard him raise his voice. He is a gentleman in every sense of the word. We will all miss him.

To his gracious wife, Hama, and his three children, Virginia, Jack, and Gordon, I offer my congratulations and hope that he will spend the remaining years of his very fruitful life in happiness and ease.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have an opportunity to say a word about the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

His thoughts and deliberations in the Congress have been helpful to all of us. He has been a friend to every Member of the House. I do not know of anyone who does not hold him not only in high regard for his intelligence and his character but also because of his warm friendship which he gave to everyone who came to him with any problem or associated with him in the business of the House.

Speaking as a Democrat now, I want to say he has a great number of friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. We admire him, we respect him, and we will feel his loss very greatly when he leaves the House of Representatives.

I appreciate the gentlewoman from New York making it possible for me to express these sentiments which I am sure are shared by Democrats and Republicans alike.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I deeply appreciate this privilege of saying a few words in tribute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

For some time I have served as chairman of the Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Judiciary. Our colleague, Mr. RAY, was the ranking Republican on that subcommittee.

During all of our service I have never seen JOHN RAY where he was not great. He is certainly one of the greatest lawyers in this House. In passing upon any pending legislation he has always been nonpartisan, nonpolitical. I have never seen one instance during his entire service where he had any purpose other than to do the gentlemanly, loyal, and patriotic thing.

It has been a benediction to know JOHN RAY. He has my unqualified approval and affection. I know no better man. I know no better public servant. I am a better man for having had the privilege of association and service with him. It is my judgment that he has improved everything he has ever touched. God bless you JOHN and I hope that when you are back home in New York, you may think sometimes of your Georgia colleague who will always remember you as a magnificent American.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, I am glad and happy to have this privilege of joining with the gentlewoman from New York in paying tribute to one of our esteemed colleagues who is about to retire to private life.

I know of no Member of this House who is held in higher esteem and who is more respected than the gentleman from New York, JOHN H. RAY. He is, perhaps, what might be termed a perfect legislator. He has carried out his duties and responsibilities well. He has performed his homework and he has during his tenure here in the Congress of the United States held religiously to principle and purpose.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that JOHN RAY reflects the ideals respected by every American. During the period of his service in the Congress of the United States he has stood firm in his application of the fundamental principles in which he so strongly believes in every approach that he has taken in relation to these many problems and issues that have been presented to us from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we shall miss him in this House. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER] has so aptly put it, JOHN RAY has done yeoman service during his membership in the House of Representatives and we can all

agree that he has made a valued contribution to the cause of good government.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN H. RAY is a great American. His record of service to his country will long be remembered and will influence those to follow for many years to come. I join with you in extending best wishes to JOHN RAY for many years of good health and happiness in the period of his retirement which he so richly deserves.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from New York yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Honorable JOHN RAY. I want to thank our colleague, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. GEORGE], for giving me just a moment in which to express my sincere tribute to him. Above everything, our colleague, the gentleman from New York, JOHN RAY, is a man of character. I feel that a big need in our Republic today is not the desire so much to know new things, but to do the old things that we know ought to be done.

Mr. Speaker, I think as much as any man in the Congress of the United States, JOHN RAY has always reserved for himself the privilege of the free exercise of his conscience. The fact that he has done that so successfully and that he has been reelected is a tribute not only to him, Mr. Speaker, but to the wonderful people who sent him here.

Mr. Speaker, may I, too, again say to JOHN RAY how much we shall miss him, and I wish for him, along with his many, many other friends here, many more years of happiness.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the gentlewoman from New York has taken this time in which to pay tribute to our friend JOHN RAY.

Mr. Speaker, I wish that I had some prepared remarks to honor JOHN RAY, because certainly any words uttered in his honor should be well prepared and well phrased. But the thoughts which come to my mind can be extemporaneously expressed, because JOHN RAY's friendliness, his ability, his knowledge and the good will he held toward all of his colleagues and toward all mankind is something which is very easy to bring out extemporaneously.

Mr. Speaker, if I were asked at this moment to characterize JOHN RAY, the first word that would come to my mind is that he is a gentleman. Then, I would think of his efficiency, of his quiet forcefulness, and of his stamina, as well as his persistence in the pursuit of principle.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of the privileged to come to Congress as a freshman with JOHN RAY in the 83d Congress. I was one of those privileged to participate in a Wednesday morning breakfast group which met every week for a good many years to discuss the issues before the Congress. I can safely say that that group never would have existed through the years and remained active had it not

been for the fact that JOHN RAY personally held it together.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN RAY's attendance record here on the floor of the House certainly can be equaled by no other Member. Always JOHN was here in the back row, listening, watching over the people's business. JOHN RAY has contributed a great deal to his party and, the Republican Party is better because of changes his suggestions have brought about. And yet his partisanship was always tempered, as it should be under our two-party system, by what is good for his country first. We of the 83d club will particularly miss JOHN RAY. We wish him everything that is good.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay a tribute to the service of the gentleman from New York, JOHN RAY, in the House and particularly in the Merchant Marine Committee. I have had the honor and the pleasure to serve with him on the Merchant Marine Committee, and I can testify to his good, sound judgment, his faithful adherence to his duties on the committee, his interest in the American merchant marine and the other subjects that come under the jurisdiction of the Merchant Marine Committee of the House.

I, too, will miss JOHN RAY. He is a fine, outstanding Christian gentleman, and I have learned to hold him in high regard and with warm and deep affection. I wish for him the many good things he is entitled to in his retirement.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay my tribute to JOHN RAY. I should like to say that when I first heard his name it was in 1954 when my committee was deliberating over the expenditure of moneys that we had raised in behalf of Congressmen from the State of New York. It was not hard, when the name of JOHN RAY came up, for those who were deliberating because everyone there commented on the fine record that he had made. Therefore, it is not surprising that in 1958, when I first ran for Congress, constituents of the 27th Congressional District of New York began to let me know that I would be joining a very great man, JOHN RAY, when I got down here.

I remember especially a conversation with the chairman of the American Telephone and Telegraph Co. who lives in my district, and who was keen that I meet and get to know JOHN RAY. Believe me, when I arrived, I was very thankful that I had the introduction that brought JOHN RAY close to me in some of the deliberations that we have had here.

When I think of JOHN RAY I think of him as a Congressman's Congressman. So often he is on the back rail in the House as we are trying to reach a decision whether to vote yea or nay on

an issue. I know that I have left my seat here on innumerable occasions to go to the back rail and find JOHN RAY and ask him, "What are the fundamentals of this bill?" This is where he has contributed so much to us here in the House. He is a deep thinker, one who has a fund of information and background which few can match.

Mr. Speaker, I know I shall miss him very much, and more especially than missing him I am going to carry with me some of the quality of thinking that I hope I have learned from him.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to associate myself with my colleagues who have made remarks about our colleague from New York, JOHN RAY, who is retiring at the end of this session. Congressman RAY and I came to the House of Representatives during the same session. I was privileged to get to know him early in my service.

JOHN RAY possesses one of the finest analytical minds in the House of Representatives. He is recognized as one of the outstanding lawyers of this country to come to Congress. His contributions have been manifold. His efforts and his effectiveness have contributed in large measure to the enactment of good legislation and oftentimes to the defeat of bad legislation. Even though Mr. RAY and I are of different political parties and come from parts of the country widely separated in distance, I have found that on many occasions our thoughts and our philosophies were somewhat parallel one with the other.

He has performed a magnificent service to his district, to his State, and to our Nation during the five terms that he has served as a Member of this body.

I wish to thank the gentlewoman from New York for taking this special order today so that we may join with her and with the Members of the New York delegation in paying tribute to our friend.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER].

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during the period of my service in this body to have served with a great many men of all kinds of political philosophy, but I can say in all truth that JOHN RAY represented to those of us who came in everyday contact with him the type of man who always attempted to do the right thing, whatever his political philosophy.

Those of us on the Committee on the Judiciary, a committee that considers all sorts of legislation, and as you know, over 60 percent of the bills introduced in the House come to this committee, are going to miss him because ours is truly a pick-and-shovel job. It is only because of the efforts and attainments of men like JOHN RAY that we are able to boast that more of our legislation is reported unanimously than that which comes from any other committee of the House. He has been literally a Rock of Gibraltar in that committee. We are all going to miss him.

I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all of the members of the committee when I say that we hope for him many, many years of happiness.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY] has been a member of the Committee on the Judiciary. When I came to the Congress it was my privilege to be assigned to that committee. Thus I feel that I have stood in a very personal relationship to the gentleman from New York. Coming to Congress as a freshman, I had much to learn, and it was through his patience, his wisdom, and his counsel that I did learn much about the workings of the Committee on the Judiciary and of the House. I think this is an important function that a veteran Member of the House can perform. It carries on the traditions of the House. It carries on the work of the Congress with a continuity which contributes much to the stability of the country.

Therefore, it is with a sense of personal gratitude and appreciation that I rise to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from New York and to express a deep debt to Mr. RAY. I join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania in extending personal wishes to him for many, many years of life and happiness and continued constructive service as a citizen of the United States.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND].

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the gentlewoman from New York has taken this time to publicly acclaim our regard and affection for JOHN RAY. I join with all of my colleagues here in expressing our esteem for him.

For my part, let me say I think he is one of the most delightful persons I have ever met. No matter what the weather, no matter what the problem, JOHN RAY's personality and character are always the same. He is always pleasant, happy, and affable. He, indeed, is a gentleman in the highest and most noble sense of that word. He is a dedicated individual tremendously interested in the problems that affect America and the matters that are resolved here on the floor of this great body.

He was, indeed, an extraordinarily successful man in private life and he carried this talent for success into public life and into the Halls of Congress. His character and personality pervaded his office and was reflected in the people who worked with him and for him.

Again I say, for my part I am delighted to have had the opportunity to meet him and to know him and I am delighted that I have this opportunity so graciously presented to us by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE], to express to JOHN RAY and to his lovely wife my best wishes for many, many years of happiness and health.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank my colleague.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentlewoman from New York, that I am glad Mr. MATHIAS rose to speak. In the four or five eulogies I have heard in commendation of retiring colleagues, I think more often than not, it has been the Members with a number of years of service who rise to speak. But I think in many ways, those of us who are freshmen are going to miss people like JOHN RAY even more than the gentlewoman from New York or my more senior colleagues who have already spoken. I would like to add something that probably not very many can. We have all mentioned and commended Mr. RAY for how wonderful he is and for his gentlemanly qualities and for his ability and intellect and the way he conducts himself on the committee, but possibly I can add a point to that. I happen to believe that even more than all of this that—I think most of the time he is right. Not only is he able, not only is he decisive, not only is he an expert on the committee, but I think more often than not he takes the right position on legislation. I hope you will not think that is a backdoor approach in complimenting myself because I consider it an honor when I look at the voting record each morning and about 95 percent of the time I find myself in association with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY].

I might say at this point, whenever I see I have voted in a different way than the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY], I usually want to take a second look at the reason why I voted in the opposite camp. So I think he is not only a gentleman, he is not only able, but I think he expresses a philosophy that I would add, unfortunately, does not have enough advocates at the present time. I, too, wish him the very best and those of us of the 87 Club are going to miss him more and feel the void more than many of the Members who have already spoken. I am very glad to associate myself with the gentlewoman and those who have spoken previously.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentlewoman from New York for giving the Members of the House this opportunity to speak about the character and service of our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RAY]. JOHN H. RAY is possessed of warm and human qualities. Very seldom do we on the Committee on the Judiciary have the opportunity to associate with one whose high sense of justice and equity as applied to the legal problems confronting us in our work on the committee so keenly manifests itself as in the case of Mr. JOHN RAY.

I believe each Congressman and each Congresswoman reflects the attitude of his or her community, and certainly the attitude and aspirations of their constituents and of the advisory group in that community. Mr. RAY personifies the

true lawyer who weighs principles of equity with rules of evidence, and in committee I have always found that his opinion on any legal question was substantial and basic. This faculty of making determinations in such matters indicates a legal mind both brilliant and excellent. Many times witnesses who have come before the committee have undergone that experience and they and every one of his colleagues on the committee respect him in his judgments. His reasonableness of approach has been a guide to us in voting on the basic questions involved in legislation.

As one member of the committee and I am sure I speak for all of my colleagues on the committee, I want to say we are losing a strong adjunct of our committee insofar as the capacity to determine legal questions is involved. I regret that he is retiring from this great service and dedication that he has given to our great Nation and to his wonderful State, as he has expressed it in conversation with us, to enjoy the later years of his life.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the gentleman from New York, the Honorable JOHN RAY, who is retiring voluntarily from the Congress.

It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve on the same committee with JOHN RAY. No Member has been more constant in his attendance or more diligent in his duties in committee and on the floor of the House.

As the gentlewoman from New York has already stated, he is a brilliant lawyer. I have often gone to him for advice and counsel, which has been patiently, freely, and wisely given.

I deeply regret that my warm friend, JOHN RAY, is leaving this body, for he is truly a great American, and I should like to add, a constitutional American.

I want to wish for him and to Mrs. Ray many years of health and happiness.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join with my colleagues in expressing regret at the retirement from Congress of the gentleman from New York, Representative JOHN RAY.

When I contemplate the absence from this House of JOHN RAY I am reminded of a senator of ancient Rome who once said: "I would rather people would ask why there was no statue of me than why there was a statue of me."

Such is the modesty and quiet way of JOHN RAY that I am led to predict that no statue in his honor will be erected and yet those of us who are acquainted with the conscious manner in which he has carried out his legislative responsibilities might well agree that if such recognition—even a statue—should ever be erected to honor any of us who are pres-

ently Members of this House properly and on the basis of pure merit it should be JOHN RAY. As one who came to Congress at the same time as JOHN RAY and was a member of a group with him who had breakfast together each week to exchange views on matters before this House my association with him has been a deeply appreciated experience. Certainly no Member of Congress, past, present or future, will ever reflect a greater measure of intellectual honesty and integrity in his record of service. Every one of JOHN's colleagues knows that his votes on legislation have never been influenced by political expediency. Invariably he exercised wisdom based on a combination of careful study, sound principle and the national interest.

Mr. Speaker, JOHN RAY has held the respect and admiration of all his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and like other Members I shall always look on my service with him as a wonderful privilege. Especially, I enjoyed sharing membership on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee with him and JOHN RAY was a most valuable member due to his long legal experience and familiarity with business. I am, of course, sorry that I lack words to more fully express my admiration for his contribution but I can and do say, thank you, JOHN, for your friendship and fine example and I hope that our paths will cross frequently in the future and that adequate satisfaction will always be yours for rendering such outstanding public service.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, in the 10 years I have served in Congress, I know of none whose retirement from this body I regret more than that of the gentleman from New York. [Mr. RAY]. To this body he brought a vast reservoir of experience and training. On this reservoir I have drawn liberally. The advice and guidance he has given me has made my task easier, my path smoother, my experience happier.

Time will not permit me here to inventory his many talents and virtues. His own demeanor, conduct, and achievement speak more eloquently than my feeble tongue can articulate. During his service in the House of Representatives, no challenge has been too big and no chore too small. Every challenge he has met with courage. Every chore he has undertaken with a cheerful spirit of altruism. To every challenge and every chore he has applied a patient, meticulous methodology which produces definitive results. In the performance of his official duties as a representative of the people of his district, and in the discharge of his obligations to the people of the United States at large, he has been motivated and inspired by the noblest principles and purest purposes. Always zealous to conserve and perpetuate the good ideas of the past, he has also been willing to embrace new

ideas when they are proven to be true ideas. Intellectual honesty is the soul of integrity; JOHN RAY is the soul of integrity; and things which are equal to the same thing are equal to each other.

Knowing him, fondly and intimately, as I do, I am confident that his years of retirement, which he has so richly earned, will not be idle years. Whatever he may later add to his record of service to his fellow men, he can rest content in the certain knowledge that he has already left footprints on the sands of time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the public service of our colleague from New York, JOHN RAY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentlewoman from New York and my other colleagues in the House in paying tribute to JOHN RAY on his retirement from this body. It has been a great pleasure to serve with JOHN RAY in Congress, and I have enjoyed my association with him.

JOHN RAY is not only a brilliant lawyer but a great American. He is a sound thinker on national issues, and is a strong believer in constitutional government.

It has been a privilege to know JOHN RAY, and I have enjoyed our frequent visits. I hope he enjoys his retirement, and I wish him much happiness in the years ahead.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to join with my colleagues from New York State and all over the Nation in this earnest appreciation of JOHN RAY as he leaves the House of Representatives and retires.

It has been a real pleasure to have served with JOHN. This quiet, solid American has been a rewarding and steadying influence on all of us who have had the privilege of knowing and associating with him.

I join all my colleagues in wishing JOHN many, many happy years to come.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in paying tribute to our distinguished colleague JOHN RAY, who has announced his retirement from Congress.

I have leaned heavily upon him during this session because I have found him to have one of the most outstanding legal minds in Congress. He is, without doubt, one of the best constitutional lawyers that I have had the opportunity to meet. He always looks at an issue in the first instance to determine whether or not it is constitutional and then whether or not it is good for the Nation.

Above all, I have never known him to sacrifice principle for political expediency. I deem it a rare privilege to have had the honor to serve with JOHN RAY this short time, and I shall never forget his many kindnesses to me.

I wish to extend to him and Mrs. Ray my very best wishes for their continued

health and happiness, now that he has decided to leave the political arena.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mrs. ST. GEORGE] and to pay affectionate respect to our beloved retiring colleague JOHN RAY after a decade of distinguished service to the House as the Representative of Staten Island in my home city of New York. In the 86th and 87th Congresses it was our pleasure and profit to have the counsel of JOHN RAY as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary which he served tirelessly and with great good will. A distinguished lawyer, JOHN RAY was always thoughtful and considerate in his relations with the committee and its chairman. All on our side of the aisle will miss him sorely. We hope he will not forget us. We shall surely remember him affectionately.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, the decision of our colleague, JOHN H. RAY, to retire from the Congress at the end of this session is deeply regretted in the House and in his 15th New York District.

JOHN is a man of quite force, sound judgment and firm principles. His attention to his responsibilities is well known. No one could be more faithful. We have observed his regular attendance on the Floor, appreciating that he is following all legislative action with understanding and objectivity. His legal training has made him keenly perceptive, prompting us to welcome his observations and opinions on complex bills.

His sincere interest in all that affected his district has made him responsive to its special needs. His constituents have appreciated the effective response he has given to their problems.

Personally, I will always remember the warm, friendly greeting with which JOHN welcomed me when I first entered this body. I have valued greatly his friendship and I wish for him health and happiness in his retirement. He carries with him the respect and admiration of all who have been privileged to know him.

Mr. WHARTON. Mr. Speaker, over the years it has been most interesting to observe the biennial contributions to the House from various segments of our economy. Industry and the legal profession gave us the gentleman from New York, JOHN RAY, in the 83d Congress and a most valuable contribution, as it has been proven. We have seldom observed such sincere tributes from both sides of the aisle as we have heard here today.

Meticulous study of legislative problems, a perfect attendance record, and a rare ability to weigh the consequences of untried proposals, have all combined to make our departing colleague an ideal Congressman. This is

not his first retirement, however; he has a previous record along that line, and I suspect that we have not yet heard the last of his varied accomplishments.

However, the end of his present tenure gives us this opportunity to wish JOHN and Mrs. Ray Godspeed and best wishes in all of their future activities.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join and associate myself with the statements that have been made about the character and service of our colleague, the Honorable JOHN RAY, of New York. The tributes paid to him are most highly deserved. I concur in them completely.

The district he has represented and the Nation he has served have been greatly benefited by Congressman RAY's membership in the House of Representatives.

We shall all miss him. I will particularly feel his absence. My hope is that in his retirement I can still call upon him for counsel as I have so many times during his membership here.

He is a great statesman, combining a keen mind and sound judgment with a willingness to work untiringly for the good of his country and his neighbors.

As he leaves, I join in saluting him and wishing him and his wife many years of pleasant retirement.

FACILITATING ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Mr. WALTER submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, one of the main problems to be considered next year by the new Congress must pertain to the serious troubles besetting the educational system.

As Congress struggles through the mass of conflicting reports, pressures, and opposing sides in the dispute on Federal aid to education, our teachers and our school systems are carrying on under difficult conditions.

Every State and almost every school district are running into the same perennial troubles: loss of tax base, insufficient revenues, mounting costs for all services, supplies, and maintenance of our school plants and finally the most important, losing good qualified teachers for the lack of finances to put into effect and maintain a reasonable salary schedule.

Too many of our legislators seem to be completely unaware of the seriousness of the situation in some areas.

Even the most dedicated teacher must pay bills, taxes, and live in our high

cost economy. The problem is one of simple economics. A recent report shows that the average income earner must earn at least \$6,000 a year to be able to provide the needs of our cost of living indexes.

This means that the drive and appeal by schoolteachers for a salary schedule from \$6,000 minimum to \$14,000 with required degrees after 8 years of teaching is indeed within the range of a reasonable goal.

This Congress failed in its attempts to write Federal law to help the local districts with their financial problems.

The problem may be called a local one by some but the harmful effects of the present situation go beyond the local geographical and political limits and are rapidly adding up to a national crisis.

Every day we are reminded of our school problem by radio, TV, and our newspapers. But like Mark Twain's remarks about the weather, "Everyone talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it."

It seems to this Member of Congress and as a member of the Committee on Education of the Congress that our records and our hearings on this question have run their full course and now the Congress as a whole must accept the full responsibility for action without reservation on the main question.

The main question as I see it is this: "Can this Nation continue its economic and social gains, plus its military strength, without the aid of the Federal Government in our educational system?"

It is as simple as that; none of us has any desire to, nor do we intend to, allow a Federal takeover any more than we have allowed a takeover of our highways or other federally assisted State operated activities.

In no way would the aid be more than a distribution of funds from the Federal Treasury for disbursement of the States under State laws according to the needs of the educational departments of the various State governments.

We find that our American public schools are plagued by shortages of everything—everything, that is, but students. There is a classroom shortage of more than 140,000, and a teacher shortage estimated from 140,000 to 250,000. In the words of Arthur Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under President Eisenhower, these shortages cheat at least 10 million American schoolchildren of a first-rate education.

With more than 37½ million youngsters crowding our public schools now, enrollment is expected to climb by at least a million a year for many years to come. At present, it is up 10 million over 5 years ago. Despite the fact that classroom construction has been at alltime highs over the past 5 years, it has not dent the backlog and barely keeps abreast of annual enrollment increases.

The problem will grow more, not less, acute unless programs of Federal aid to school construction and teachers' salaries are enacted by the Congress.

The fountainhead of the problems hampering our school systems is another critical shortage: money. State and community tax resources already are strained to the hilt. They cannot keep

pace with growing requirements. Further, there is a huge gap in quality of education separating wealthy States and communities from their low-income counterparts. Only Federal taxing power is able to insure equality of educational opportunity among States.

It is not that States and municipalities are not trying hard to meet the school crisis. Many are. For example, Idaho spends the same percentage of its total income on schools as does New York. But in Idaho, this results in an annual expenditure per pupil of only \$285; in New York \$585. The difference in terms of education is staggering. Yet no one would argue that the school child in Idaho is less entitled to a good education than the pupil in New York. The spread between rich State and poor ranges from New York, which spends the highest, to Alabama, whose \$217 annual expenditure per pupil is the Nation's lowest.

The problem goes deeper than that, however. Within States, children in low-income communities—and children in low-income neighborhoods of large cities—do not enjoy equal educational opportunities. In the same State there may be a community which spends more than \$1,000 per child and a neighboring community which spends only \$100. The unfairness of this is obvious. Through no fault of his own, the child in a poor neighborhood becomes disadvantaged in education, has less chance for higher education, less chance for a good job—and the pattern will repeat itself with his own children.

THE TEACHER SHORTAGE—ITS REASONS

The size of the teacher shortage cannot be pinpointed to an exact figure. Since there is a teacher for every classroom in the Nation, it might be argued that there is no shortage. But it is real, nevertheless. It is overcome only by crowding more pupils into already jammed classrooms, by holding half-day sessions and by hiring teachers who are not fully qualified.

Presently, about 92,000 public school teachers have substandard training. Annually, 22 percent of newly hired elementary school teachers do not have college degrees. This condition is aggravated by an annual withdrawal of approximately 10 percent of public school teachers, which exceeds the number of new college graduates who enter the profession.

One of the main reasons for the shortage of teachers is obvious: low salary schedules. Teachers comprise one of the lowest paid professional groups. Their average salary is about \$5,200. This is far from the \$9,476 which the University of California's Heller committee recommended as a minimum income for a "junior professional family."

THE FIGHT IN CONGRESS

Failure of the House to act on a Federal aid-to-education bill passed by the Senate killed chances to begin remedying our school problems.

Early in the 1st session of the 87th Congress, President Kennedy made three major recommendations in the field of education. The first was for Federal aid for school construction and teachers' salaries. Calling for \$2.5 billion over a

3-year span, the bill was passed by the Senate, 49-34, supported by 41 Democrats and 8 Republicans, opposed by 12 Democrats, 22 Republicans.

A similar bill, reported out by the House Education and Labor Committee, died in HOWARD SMITH'S House Rules Committee.

Kennedy's second proposal on education also was roughed up. He urged substantial improvement in the National Defense Education Act, which provides loans for students and teaching equipment to strengthen science, math, and foreign language instruction in the Nation's colleges. All that came of this was a simple extension of the present program.

A third Presidential request got the ax, the College Academic Facilities and Scholarship Act; different versions were first approved by the House and Senate. House-Senate conferees agreed on a compromise bill authorizing \$1.5 billion in grants and loans over 5 years to public and private colleges for construction of classrooms and colleges; \$250 million in grants to public community junior colleges; \$600 million for student loans.

The House voted 214-186 to recommit, thus killing the bill. Voting to bury it were 130 Republicans and 84 Democrats, mostly from the South. Upholding the aid bill were 30 Republicans and 156 Democrats.

THE ARGUMENTS AGAINST FEDERAL AID

The same tired attacks which have been leveled at most forward-looking social legislation have hit school aid proposals. The primary objection is that Federal aid to the schools would lead to Federal control of the schools. This completely ignores the fact that Federal programs have been in effect for more than a century without any attempt by the Government to decide what shall be taught, how, or by whom. Among Federal programs are the Land Grant Act of 1862 which made possible the growth of State universities; the GI bill of rights which helped millions of veterans of World War II attain a higher education; the National Defense Education Act; school milk and school lunch programs—and many others.

The charges against aid to school construction and teachers' salaries also overlook the important point that States and communities would not be required to submit to Federal interference in curricula. Their school systems would be tampered with in no way by the Federal Government.

RECORD ENROLLMENT IN SCHOOLS

From the latest issue of the NSBA official publication we learn that enrollment in the Nation's public schools, from kindergarten through college, reached a new alltime high of 51.3 million at the start of the current school year, according to U.S. Office of Education estimates. This marks the 18th consecutive year that enrollments have increased.

Current figures represent a 2 million jump over those registered at the start of the 1961 school year. The rate of increase is also climbing, as the 1961 figures were only 1.4 million higher than those of the year before.

Of the total enrollment, 39.7 million students are enrolled in the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools, 6.7 million in nonpublic schools, and 4.6 million in colleges and universities.

By breaking down the increase into categories, it becomes apparent that the secondary schools and colleges are shouldering the brunt of the increase. Secondary school enrollments are up 8.3 percent over last year; higher education enrollments are up 7 percent; and elementary enrollments, 2.3 percent.

The Office of Education also estimated that 1,744,000 teachers would be needed by the public and nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. According to the National Education Association, the Nation will be about 250,000 short of meeting this figure. The NEA says this many new teachers are needed to replace ones who left the profession, to relieve overcrowded classrooms, and to replace teachers who are not as well qualified as they should be.

News of special interest to teachers comes out of New York where the 70,000 member American Federation of Teachers announces its drive for a \$6,000 a year minimum starting salary for teachers with a goal of \$14,000 for teachers with bachelor degrees and 8 years of service. The teachers have been pledged full support from all segments of the AFL-CIO, according to the statement of Walter Reuther, vice president of the organization.

The Supreme Court prayer ban is still causing many arguments. The controversy and confusion over the Court's ruling that it was unconstitutional to recite a State prescribed prayer in New York schools has heightened with the opening of a new school year. Boards of education, caught in the middle of the conflict, are looking for some direction in the legal maze that exists.

When the Court's decision was first handed down, many educators and legal experts tried to explain the ruling by saying it merely prohibited the reciting of a prayer which had been composed by any unit of government. The Court's opinion said that government should stay out of the business of writing official prayers. However, more recent developments seem to indicate that the Court was ruling against any form of prayer sanctioned or prescribed by a school board, regardless of the author.

This interpretation is borne out by the most recent ruling of New York State Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr., concerning religious practices in the schools. Allen ruled that it would be in violation of the Court order for the Hicksville, Long Island, school board to designate part of the national anthem as an official prayer. The crux of Allen's opinion was that the lines of "The Star-Spangled Banner" had been adopted as an official prayer. However, the commissioner said he could find nothing that would prevent the reading, reciting, or singing of the national anthem.

These developments show that much has been said and more will be said before we arrive at a common policy for all 50 States.

Cases before the Court including Perma's practices will be decided in the

near future if the petitions now before the Court are acted upon.

At least one district has moved on the question of leaves of absence for teachers who wish to enroll in the Peace Corps.

The Los Angeles Board of Education approved a policy which will grant such leaves to all teachers who join the Peace Corps.

Retired teachers are in demand and the Peace Corps is giving preferential consideration to all applicants. In most of the nations requesting Peace Corps men and women the first request is for qualified teachers. The Peace Corps offices in Washington welcome all inquiries.

Most observers are enthusiastic over the great record made to date by this latest weapon in our fight against the spread of communism. I have personally talked to some of our own local residents who have been sent to Ethiopia as teachers.

EDUCATIONAL TV GROWING UP

More than 1,000 additional television channels will be needed to satisfy the educational television requirements of the Nation in the next decade.

That was the conclusion of the first nationwide survey of educational television conducted by the National Association of Education Broadcasters for the Office of Education. In carrying out the survey, NAEB took into account the projected needs of colleges and universities, local school systems, and State departments of education.

A primary concern of the NAEB in basing its estimate was that educational television "must reach far beyond the formal system of schools and provide opportunities for continuing education at every stage of life."

The survey found that the school systems of the country reported a greater need for educational television than the colleges and universities. More than 95 percent of the public schools surveyed reported serious curriculum deficiencies or teaching needs. Most said these could be met, or greatly helped, by educational television.

The survey recommended that the primary educational television channel in a community should be in the very high frequency—standard broadcast—band, because most of the larger population centers are equipped for VHF reception and it also offers greater coverage at less cost. Since sufficient VHF channels are not now available, the survey concludes that the deficit must be met with ultra-high frequency channels as UHF sets become available.

In arriving at its estimate of the number of channels needed, the NAEB believes that each community or educational complex using television for systematic instruction will need from 2 to 12 channels for simultaneous transmission. In most instances, they found, UHF will serve these local multichannel needs.

It has been my custom over the years to give a report of the status of the bills on education.

The following list is comprised of legislation our committee acted upon and the present status of the proposals:

A. LEGISLATION ENACTED

1. The Practical Nurse Training Extension Act of 1961; Public Law 87-22 (April 24, 1961). Amended to include practical nurse training. Important for Negroes since so many Negro women are employed in this field.

2. Establishment of teaching hospital for Howard University; Public Law 87-262 (September 22, 1961). Important for Negroes since more than 50 percent of Negro physicians have been trained at Howard University. The transferral of Freedmen's Hospital as a teaching hospital enhances the professional preparation possible at Howard.

3. Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; Public Law 87-274 (September 22, 1961). The first legislation of its kind to be passed. Provides Federal assistance for projects which will evaluate and demonstrate techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's problems relating to the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses and to provide training of personnel for work in these fields.

4. Teachers for the deaf and speech pathologists and audiologists; Public Law 87-276 (September 22, 1961).

5. Education of the blind and increased appropriations for the American Printing House for the Blind; Public Law 87-294 (September 22, 1961).

6. Extend National Defense Education Act of 1958; extend impacted areas (extension of Public Law 815 and Public Law 874); Public Law 87-344 (October 3, 1961).

7. Amendment to title II of National Defense Education Act; Public Law 87-400 (October 5, 1961). National Defense Education Act important especially for student loan provisions.

8. Passed House and Senate, awaiting President's signature—captioned films for the deaf. Passed House September 17, 1962. Passed Senate August 13, 1962; with House amendments September 18, 1962.

B. PASSED HOUSE

1. School Lunch Act (amended) (June 6, 1962). Important to Negroes since it removes the specific designation to race.

C. BILLS PASSED BY COMMITTEE AND IN RULES COMMITTEE—DATE REFERRED TO RULES COMMITTEE

1. University extension (May 31, 1962).

2. Special education and vocational rehabilitation (July 5, 1962).

3. Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts (July 19, 1961).

4. Adult basic education (April 2, 1962); recommended by President.

5. Quality Education Act (May 31, 1962); recommended by President.

6. General aid to elementary and secondary education.

7. Overall revision of National Defense Education Act (July 6, 1961).

8. Amendment to Land Grant Colleges Act to eliminate the "separate but equitable" clause of the act (May 23, 1962).

9. Amendments to impacted areas laws to deny payments to school districts that practice racial discrimination and segregation (May 31, 1962).

For those who have a special interest in certain phases of our legislative programs the following list catalogs the committee reports available as long as they are in print.

A request to my Washington office can be made for any committee prints still available.

D. COMMITTEE PRINTS ON EDUCATION

1. "Federal Aid for Education" (May 1961).

2. "The University in Latin America: Argentina and the Alliance for Progress" (September 1961).

3. "Federal Interest in Education" (September 1961).

4. "Higher Education in Soviet Union" (January 1962).

5. "Congressional Action for Higher Education" (January 1962).

6. "The New Image in Education" (February 1962).

7. "A Directory of Federally Financed Student Loans, Fellowships, and Career Training Programs in the Field of Higher Education in the United States" (April 1962).

8. "Views on Relationships of Church and State in the Field of Education" (May 1962).

9. "Integration in Public Education Programs" (May 1962).

10. "Interim Report on Education and Citizenship in the Public School System of Puerto Rico" (August 1962).

CRITICAL OIL PROBLEMS CONTINUE

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, the independent oil industry in my home State of Texas, and in other oil-producing States, remains in a critically depressed condition. Every day independent oil producers go out of business and more people are unemployed.

It had been hoped, of course, that this problem could have been somewhat alleviated by amendment of the national security clause in the Trade Expansion Act which was signed by the President today.

The supporters of this amendment were assured that they would receive instead an Executive order dealing effectively with imports from the Near East and Canada.

Extensive hearings have proved the need for import restrictions. This vital industry must retain its ability to produce the fuel needed for our military operations, as well as our increasing everyday needs.

The facts indicate that this ability to produce, to find new reserves, is being seriously hampered by excessive oil imports. This is because the domestic oil industry has not shared at all in the increased demands for oil and its products in the past 5 years. All the increase in demand has been satisfied by import of cheap foreign oil.

This has meant that independent operators no longer find it economically feasible to search for new oil reserves. In my own district, which is one of the centers of independent oil producers, drilling rigs are selling for almost literally a dime a dozen. Operations have come to a near standstill. Most of the oil production today comes from secondary recovery, a process of gaining the last available drop of oil from old wells which are almost exhausted.

When these reserves are gone, we will be seriously lacking in new reserves unless the situation is changed soon.

Mr. Speaker, the Trade Expansion Act was signed into law today by President Kennedy. Congress is about to adjourn. A new Executive order is due to be issued before January 1, 1963.

The oil producers and the people from oil-producing areas need to know where they stand in this picture. This need is vital and urgent. We have been given assurance by the administration that this order will be forthcoming, and will be favorable to the independent producers. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this order will be issued immediately. If this is not possible, then the President should tell the public what will be contained in the order when it is issued.

This problem must be resolved quickly in order to save one of our most important industries from further serious damage.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY REFORM BILL

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, since its creation in September of 1959, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, of which I am now ranking minority member, has held a number of public hearings involving highway practices and procedures followed in several selected States. The disclosures have been shocking.

In our own State of Florida it was shown that over the years many of the big highway contractors have been making payments of cash, whisky, turkeys, and other merchandise of substantial value to officials and employees of the State road department who were, of course, paid by the State to see that these same contractors complied with specifications. The Florida hearings have also shown that due to inadequate planning and worse, the State has disposed of valuable improvements on rights-of-way in total disregard of the public interest and has allowed the contractors and speculators to reap windfall profits that should have been realized by the State, a system that has permitted some contractors to use these valuable assets for what might be euphemistically called payola to grease the palms of two city commissioners and at least one highway official.

In Oklahoma, it was disclosed that there had been a deplorable failure to meet specifications during the construction of at least one highway. The hearings disclosed an amazing picture of inadequate or no supervision, failure to make proper tests and inspections, falsification of test reports and samples, and the fact that a member of the Oklahoma Highway Commission was a hidden mem-

ber of a firm bidding on highway department sodding contracts.

Hearings concerning highway construction practices in the State of New Mexico disclosed events somewhat similar to those which occurred in Oklahoma. Detailed evidence was presented showing negligent or nonexistent inspections, failure to comply with construction specifications and the failure of a highway project before it was opened to traffic.

Hearings involving right-of-way acquisition practices in Massachusetts were started last February and continued for several weeks. These hearings disclosed a revolting pattern of conspiracy between certain State employees, appraisers, and attorneys resulting in the payment of clearly inflated prices for property needed for highway rights-of-way. The hearings did not cover fraudulent practices of contractors and consulting engineers despite my insistence that these matters be fully exposed. However, I understand the Bureau of Public Roads is continuing to investigate these matters.

The latest hearings of the subcommittee held last July concerning right-of-way acquisition practices in West Virginia. Among other things, it was disclosed at these hearings that the practice is followed of requiring State highway department employees to make regular monthly contributions to the Democratic Party sustaining fund. State employees are furnished with a coupon book for their use in making the regular payment. State officials have denied that these contributions are mandatory but I have letters in my files from State employees who state that the only way they can keep their job or get a promotion is to make these so-called voluntary contributions.

The disclosures are certainly not at an end and investigations are continuing in a number of areas. However, it has become disturbingly clear that the Federal laws need to be greatly strengthened in order to protect the public interest. In September of 1961, more than a year ago, I introduced a bill to provide for a Federal-Aid Highway Reform Act. This bill would add several new provisions to the law and amend some portions of existing law and would, in my opinion, greatly strengthen the Federal law enforcement agencies in their efforts to prevent frauds and abuses and to punish such actions when they are detected.

Among other things, my bill, H.R. 9353, would prohibit political contributions by firms or individuals contracting with States on Federal-aid highway projects, prohibit kickbacks and other unauthorized compensation to State employees working on Federal-aid highway projects and make it unlawful for certain officials or employees of a State or any federally aided projects to engage in conflicts of interest such as the subcommittee has found in Florida and other States.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has also recognized the need for revising existing Federal statutes and, in March of this year, submitted proposed legislation to the Congress as part of its legis-

lative program. However, when asked to submit its views on my earlier bill, the Department of Commerce urged enactment of their proposed legislation on the apparent grounds that it objected to two essential provisions of my bill. In the letter commenting on my bill, Undersecretary Edward Gudeman stated:

It is considered that the provisions of the pending bill which would amend title 18, United States Code, section 611, to prohibit political contributions by firms or individuals contracting with States on Federal-aid highway projects may be exceedingly restrictive. It is suggested that such provisions may not achieve their apparent purpose and would be extremely difficult of enforcement. That section of the proposed legislation relating to conflicts of interest is very similar to the provisions of section 1.33 of Regulations for the Administration of Federal Aid for Highways which are required to be enforced by the State.

This is a most amazing position to take. In the first place, existing Federal law, enacted in 1940, prohibits firms and individuals performing certain contracts with the United States from making political contributions to any political party, committee, or candidate for public office or to any person for any political purpose or use, and equally punishes anyone who knowingly solicits any such contributions. This in my judgment is sound public policy designed to prevent indirect financing of campaigns for and elections to public office out of the U.S. Treasury. The statute does not, however, extend the same protections with regard to abuses of Federal-aid highway funds because in this case the contracts are with the States and not the United States. But if it is bad to misuse Federal funds for political purposes at the Federal level, it is equally bad at the State level for the obvious evil to be remedied is that Congress has not appropriated these funds for political use.

My bill would simply extend to State contracts on Federal-aid highway projects substantially the same provisions which now apply with respect to contracts with the United States. I simply do not understand why the Department of Commerce would take the position that this change in the law should not be made.

With respect to the portion of my bill having to do with conflicts of interest, the Secretary of Commerce commented that the provision is very similar to one of the regulations for the administration of Federal aid for highways promulgated by the Secretary of Commerce but required to be enforced by the States. This comment is an obvious non sequitur. First, the sordid episodes which have been revealed by our subcommittee have demonstrated that the regulation of the Secretary of Commerce is obviously ineffective. Secondly, my purpose in introducing this bill was to provide the Federal Government with weapons with which to protect Federal funds rather than to leave this a matter to be enforced by the States.

It may be that further investigations and further hearings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway

Program will disclose a need for further legislation needs in the bill I have introduced. If so, I shall prepare and introduce such legislation. In the meantime, I am convinced that H.R. 9353 is urgently needed and I plan to reintroduce the bill next session of Congress and to continue to press for its enactment.

I requested that hearings be held by the Committee on the Judiciary, on which I serve, and made a request to the chairman that this be done shortly after introducing the bill early this session. It is deplorable that action has not been taken on this much-needed legislation, particularly in view of the findings of the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program, indicating the need for this legislation. Apparently it was not considered important by the New Frontier or consideration would have been pushed and hearings would have been held, and perhaps a bill to prevent wrongdoing in the highway program, which could to some extent be avoided in the future, would have been passed. I am sure that everyone who saw the Brinkley report, entitled "The Great Highway Robbery," are at a loss to know why action has not been taken.

JOBS GOING BEGGING

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, recently Ewan Clague, the distinguished Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor, made a highly valuable contribution to the discussion of our Nation's employment and unemployment problem. The occasion for Mr. Clague's remarks was the first conference on the Manpower and Development Training Act of 1962, held at New York University on September 12, 1962.

One of the main points made by Mr. Clague—and something I have been trying to emphasize for some time—is that there are a great many jobs, both actual and potential, going begging in our economy because no one is qualified to fill them. There are widespread and persistent shortages in many professional and technical occupations, as well as further down the occupational scale, which, Mr. Clague said, could be filled if some of the unemployed were given sufficient training.

Mr. Clague made clear that this problem is likely to grow worse in the future as the shift from unskilled jobs to professional, technical, and service occupations continue.

Mr. Clague also discussed the role of technological unemployment and indicated its importance in our overall unemployment situation. A study prepared by Mr. Clague and Leon Greenberg, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics staff, showed that from 1953 to 1959 the decrease in employment for all workers

in manufacturing as a whole, due to technological factors, was about three-quarters of a million jobs. Separate estimates for production workers only showed a loss in employment caused by advancing technology of over 1,100,000 workers. For a number of reasons, which Mr. Clague spelled out, these figures understate the problem of technological unemployment.

I think this address by Mr. Clague should be read with great care and thought by those who are interested in seeking a solution to the persistence of a high level of unemployment in this country, even during a period of relative prosperity. While falling demand may affect output and thus eliminate jobs, there has been altogether too much emphasis placed on inadequate demand as a cause of our high level of unemployment. The time is long overdue for an increase in emphasis and attention on our job vacancies and on the efforts that are required on all levels of government, and in the private sector, to ease the adjustments which automation and technological changes are forcing upon us. We need an upgrading of the Nation's education and training throughout the entire skill spectrum, and I think Mr. Clague's address helps contribute to this goal. Under unanimous consent, I ask that this address be included in the RECORD at this point:

THE ECONOMIC SETTING FOR THE MANPOWER TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By Ewan Clague, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, before the first conference on Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, New York University, New York, N.Y., September 12, 1962)

The manpower training and development program is the product of the last 5 years' experience with unemployment in the American economy. The passage of the act by the Congress in the spring of 1962 represented the first public decision for a longer range solution of the unemployment problem; the temporary extensions of unemployment benefits in 1958 and again in 1961 were strictly short range in purpose, being based upon the hope that recession unemployment would disappear in subsequent prosperity periods.

Two facts about unemployment influenced the decision to seek a longer range solution. These were, first, the higher level of unemployment in recent years, even during business prosperity; and second, the increased duration of unemployment, especially the number of unemployed out of work more than 26 weeks, which is the usual duration of unemployment insurance benefits. There is, of course, a direct relationship between level and duration; as the volume of unemployment rises, the duration is generally longer also. However, a clear distinction can be drawn between these two aspects of the problem. If industrial change is rapid, and labor turnover is high, millions of workers may experience temporary periods of unemployment; but if industry is expanding and jobs are plentiful, these millions can be reemployed within reasonable periods of time. Under such conditions, unemployment insurance is the appropriate program for the problem; what the unemployed worker and his family need is temporary assistance to tide them over until another job is obtained. During the decade and a half from 1941 to 1957 this was the only program that was needed. It is still the basic bulwark against unemployment; even during the last 5 years,

the great majority of the unemployed have found jobs within their benefit periods.

However, it is the duration aspect of unemployment which has become intensified in these last few years. In 1953, according to the monthly report on the labor force, there were less than an average of 100,000 unemployed out of work for more than 26 weeks. The Nation had no longrun unemployment problem at that time. During 1956, which was a highly prosperous year, the number averaged about 250,000; but in 1959 it rose to 550,000, and in the last year, from the summer of 1961 to the summer of 1962, it was still higher, on the average about 700,000. The latest figure (August 1962) is approximately 600,000—a little less than 1 percent of the labor force.

The growing number of these long-term unemployed points to the existence of some new factors affecting the employability of considerable numbers of them. Labor market analysts have pointed to a series of factors which tend to prolong the unemployment of an employable man or woman. One is geographic immobility—the continued existence of labor surplus areas, communities in which the decline of industry has left a pocket of unemployed workers. To get jobs the workers have to move out or industry has to be brought in. The area redevelopment program was designed to deal with this aspect of the problem.

The area problem is accentuated by personal and family immobility, which consists of all those factors that operate to tie the family to the community. Homeownership is an obvious one of these—the extent of homeownership among workers' families has practically doubled in the last quarter century, and the proportion is still going up. During World War II, and again during Korea, war industries paid moving expenses and other costs in order to facilitate the recruitment of workers. Of course, in such circumstances there was a job in sight in the new location. In the absence of such protections and assurances, workers today hesitate to pull up stakes and leave their home communities.

The 1960's may eventually bring some easing of this particular aspect of the problem. Young workers are far more willing to move than the oldsters. Statistics from the Bureau of the Census on the movement of the population show that young men and women in their twenties move to new places four times as often as people over age 45. So as the postwar wave of youngsters enter the labor force in the next 2 or 3 years they should constitute a more mobile element in the labor market.

Equally important in prolonging unemployment are the twin factors of industrial and occupational immobility. I call these "twins" rather than two different factors because they are closely interrelated, although they are different. For example, they can be different in that an occupation may be expanding even though the industry may be suffering a decline in employment; and the reverse can also be true. At the same time, workers attached to an industry (and to a successful firm within it) may retain their employment even though they are required to shift their jobs, their skills, and their occupations.

Industrial and occupational shifts are major factors in long-term unemployment and in the generally lengthened duration of recent years. Take industry, for example. For this purpose, I have chosen the last 5 years, since this is the period on which we are concentrating our attention; and for the comparison I have selected the first 6 months of 1957 and the first 6 months of 1962.

Total employment in the United States in the first half of 1957 averaged 64.3 million; in the first half of 1962, 67 million, an increase of 2.7 million.

However, this increase in jobs was very unevenly distributed over the industries in our economy. For example, in agriculture there was a decline from 5.9 million to 5.1 million, a net loss of over 800,000 jobs (as reported in the household survey). Fully as dramatic as this were some of the shifts of employment among nonfarm industries, as reported by employers in the employment, hours, and earnings survey. The table below highlights the contrast between those industries in which employment has expanded over the 5-year period and those in which employment has declined:

TABLE 1.—Employees on nonfarm payrolls, 1st half year averages, 1957 and 1962

[In thousands]			
Industry group	1957	1962	1957-62 change
Mining.....	826	649	-177
Construction.....	2,790	2,514	-276
Manufacturing.....	17,223	16,589	-634
Durable goods.....	9,973	9,382	-591
Nondurable goods.....	7,251	7,207	-44
Transportation and public utilities.....	4,233	3,900	-333
Wholesale and retail trade.....	10,734	11,308	+574
Finance, insurance, and real estate.....	2,450	2,768	+318
Service industries.....	6,684	7,661	+977
Federal Government.....	2,203	2,306	+103
State and local government.....	5,384	6,819	+1,435

In mining, construction, manufacturing (both durable and nondurable), and transportation and public utilities, there were fewer jobs in 1962 than in 1957. For these groups combined, the total loss was over 2 million jobs. Yet at the same time there was a net gain of nearly 3½ million jobs in the other industry groups—about 1½ million in government, about 1 million in service industries, and about 1 million in trade and finance, insurance and real estate. It is hardly necessary to point out that the drift of employment has been away from the basic industries producing food, clothing, and shelter and into those industries (and government) servicing the American people as consumers. For example, the rapid growth in State and local government employment is directly the result of the expansion of our schools and the servicing of the community needs of our expanding city population.

But even these industrial shifts do not portray the whole picture. Within many industries there have been marked occupational shifts from blue-collar jobs to white-collar. The table below highlights this shift in manufacturing (data from employer reports):

TABLE 2.—Employees on manufacturing payrolls 1st half year averages, 1957 and 1962

	Production workers	Nonproduction workers
1957.....	13,264	3,959
1962.....	12,295	4,294
1957-62 change.....	-969	+335

There was a loss of nearly a million plant jobs and an increase of a third of a million office jobs. However, the plant workers do not usually cross over into office jobs.

There is still another factor which must be taken into account in analyzing the shifts in employment among industries. Employment in industry may decline (a) because of a lack of demand for its products, or (b) because technological improvements make it possible to produce the same output with fewer workers. It is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain precise quantitative estimates of the effect of technological change in causing unemployment, but there are data which furnish some indications of the ways

in which this factor operates and the industries where it may be having some effect. In the July 1962 issue of the Monthly Labor Review, Leon Greenberg, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics staff, and I made some estimates of the interindustry effects of technological change. What we did was to take 200 industries within manufacturing as a whole and divide them into those which showed an increase in employment over the 6-year period from 1953 to 1959 and those which showed a loss in employment over the same period. Then we further subdivided both groups into those in which productivity, expressed as output per man-hour, increased and those in which it decreased.

I shall not attempt here to outline the details of our study, since I want only to summarize our results. Of course, some of the decreases in employment in particular industries were due to declines in demand for their products—their output in 1959 was less than in 1953. Then, taking this factor of declining output into account, we estimated the extent to which decreases in employment arose primarily because of rising output per man-hour. For manufacturing as a whole, the decrease in employment due to technological factors was about three-quarters of a million jobs. This figure included all workers in manufacturing, both blue collar and white collar. When we made a separate estimate for production workers only, that is, blue-collar workers in the plants, the net loss in employment was over 1,100,000. Thus, the plant workers were the ones primarily affected by changing technology.

There are two points of caution which must be expressed in connection with these figures. Mr. Greenberg and I used the term "disemployment," to describe the net loss of employment which occurred due to technological change. Disemployment is not the same as unemployment; the decrease in jobs may have been brought about by the failure to hire new employees, or by the retirement of older workers; meanwhile, some laid-off workers may have obtained jobs in other industries. However, it is obvious that workers in industries with declining employment are more likely to experience spells of unemployment than are the workers in expanding industries.

In another sense, the above figures understate the problem of technological unemployment, not only because they relate only to manufacturing rather than to the whole economy, but also because they do not take account of job losses among the firms within particular industries, even those industries in which employment increased. All that our figures measure is the extent of interindustry disemployment, not intra-industry.

The characteristics of the unemployed reflect the influence of these factors causing unemployment, that is, causing certain kinds of workers to be unemployed rather than others. For example, data from the household survey show that the annual average rate of unemployment for experienced wage and salary workers was 6.8 percent for the year 1961. However, the rate for mining, forestry, and fisheries was 11.6 percent; construction, 14.1 percent; manufacturing, 7.7 percent; while at the other extreme, the unemployment rates were as follows: public administration, 2.7 percent; finance, insurance and real estate, 3.3 percent; service industries, 4.9 percent.

The contrast among occupational groups was even more striking. The 1961 annual average rate for operatives was 9.6 percent, and for laborers (except farm and mine), 14.5 percent; while the rate for professional and technical was 2 percent; clerical workers, 4.6 percent; sales workers, 4.7 percent. Service workers (except domestics) had somewhat higher than average rates, 7.4 percent.

Finally, the long-term unemployed reflect still another part of the problem; namely, the disadvantages of age with respect to re-

employment. Among the unemployed, who had been out of work more than 26 weeks, the men 45 to 64 years of age had a rate of unemployment more than a third higher than the rate for all men. Likewise, women in those age groups had an unemployment rate well over a third higher than all women. The above data from the household survey indicate that older workers adversely affected by industrial and occupational shifts are constituting a growing unemployment problem.

If these trends could be halted at present levels, the situation might be manageable with our existing programs. But the outlook for the future is for a further development of these past trends. Our projections for the future indicate that the shift to the white-collar employments is continuing and may even accelerate—to professional and technical occupations, to sales and clerical work, to service jobs, and away from unskilled jobs, both on the farms and in industry. For young workers, both boys and girls, this emphasizes the vital importance of education and the preparation for a career. The Department of Labor has been emphasizing this point for the past several years. This coming autumn the Bureau of Labor Statistics is issuing the sixth edition of the "Occupational Outlook Handbook," which sketches the outlook for approximately 600 occupations. This book is designed to enable the young workers, high school and college, to check on the prospects for their prospective careers.

However, for established and experienced workers of all occupations the problem is different. A male head of a family in his forties or fifties is unlikely to return to school for several years to qualify for a profession. But he may be capable of learning a new occupation if afforded that opportunity. So the Manpower Development and Training Act was designed to provide opportunities for workers to obtain help to enable them to qualify for new jobs and occupations to replace the ones they have lost. The logic on which the act is based is that the great majority of the unemployed are out of work because they are unemployable, or because they aren't willing to work, or because jobs don't exist; but rather that the unemployed can and will find jobs when they are qualified to hold them. This, in turn, implies that there are actual or potential jobs in our economy which are not being filled because there is no one qualified to take them. What is the evidence that such jobs exist?

We have in this country ample qualitative evidence that such jobs do exist—unfilled orders in the public employment offices, advertisements in newspapers, the expansion of private placement agencies devoted to finding men for critical jobs. But we lack concrete statistical evidence on this point. Such data have been collected on occasion in some countries. For many years, during and after World War II, the employment offices in Great Britain collected and published such information. In fact, at one time, social security experts in Great Britain defined full employment as a condition in which the number of job vacancies in the nation was equal to the number of unemployed. That statistic had the great advantage of emphasizing that the unemployment in the economy was not due to lack of jobs, but to the inability of the unemployed to fill the jobs. It pointed toward the need for a training program to match men and jobs.

However, in recent years Great Britain has ceased compiling this statistic, largely because the conditions which made it reasonably accurate no longer exist. During World War II and in the tight labor market in the early postwar period, the British Government exercised strong control over the labor market. For example, they required employers to register all vacancies with the

public employment offices and further required them to report the filling of such vacancies to the employment service. The effect was to channel the vast majority of job orders in the economy through the employment offices, where they could be counted, tabulated, and published. With the relaxation of labor market controls, these procedures have been modified, and the job orders in the British employment offices no longer measure the job vacancies in the economy.

On a number of occasions during the past 5 years, the question has been raised as to why the Bureau of Labor Statistics does not make some effort to compile statistics of job vacancies. In the condition of the labor market of the United States today the job orders in the public employment service do not measure at all accurately the unfilled jobs in the economy—there are so many other methods of filling jobs. So the only way to obtain such a figure is to devise a questionnaire to a sample of employers, asking them to report the number of job vacancies they are trying to fill. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is planning a pilot survey on that subject. Without prejudging the test, I can only say cautiously that a job vacancy is very hard to define—is it when a job order is actually placed with a public (or private) placement agency? Is it the number of vacancies which the corporate (or Government) placement office has authorization to fill? How do we avoid exaggeration in that employers in a tight labor market often place more orders than they actually plan to fill? Despite all these problems and difficulties, the Bureau is exploring the situation to see what, if anything, can be done to quantify this crucial economic statistic.

In the absence of quantitative data, what can be said on this subject of job vacancies? There are a few points on which we are reasonably sure of the basic facts. One is that in the higher professional and technical occupations there are widespread and persistent shortages—doctors, nurses, engineers, scientists, teachers, statisticians, technicians, etc., etc. These shortages are slow to respond to placement efforts because of the fundamental educational and preparatory requirements of the jobs. But there are other shortages strung down through the occupational scale—stenographers, clerical workers, service workers, even down to domestics in the home. These are jobs which could be filled if some of the unemployed (or the underemployed) were given sufficient training—and for many of these jobs only a reasonable training period is required.

REAL ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, for some time, I have been saying, in answer to those who claim that ours is a stagnant economy, that the gross national product is not an accurate indicator of the Nation's economic growth.

The leading article in the Wall Street Journal of October 9, 1962, sheds some needed light on those areas which give a clear picture of how fast our economy is really growing. The article, for example, talks about the many new goods

and services on the market, the high level of research and development spending, the growth in consumer services, such as hospital care, and the very rapid rise in per capita disposable income, adjusted for changes in the level of prices.

Our citizens are vastly better off today than they were even a decade ago. According to this article, the American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the past 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II. This is true economic growth, and I wish that those who diagnose incorrectly some of our economic problems, because of their belief in the stagnation theory, would take note of this article. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the Record at this point:

ECONOMIC GROWTH: U.S. LIVING STANDARD RISES TWICE AS FAST IN EARLY POSTWAR ERA—PERSONAL INCOME AFTER TAXES GAINS 16 PERCENT IN PAST 8 YEARS—NINE OF TEN HOMES HAVE TV—FLAW IN GROWTH COMPARISON

(By Alfred D. Malabre, Jr.)

The American standard of living has grown twice as fast in the last 8 years as in the first 8 after World War II.

This fundamental fact shines through the fog of Federal statistics in an era of much fretting over slow growth in the Nation's economy.

There is no index of the standard of living. Measuring it precisely is impossible. But one figure comes close to the mark. This is per capita disposable income adjusted for changes in the level of prices. The disposable means it's after all personal taxes.

Since late last year this figure has held above \$2,000 for the first time. Latest tally puts it at \$2,030 in terms of 1961 prices. That's an upward bounce of 16 percent in less than 8 years. In the 8 years ended with 1954 it rose less than 7 percent.

The \$2,000-plus figure on the statistically average American's ultimate ability to buy the goods and services of life is now nearly double the \$1,212 of prewar 1939. (The 1939 total, to make it comparable despite price changes, is in terms of 1961 dollars. In 1939 dollars it was only \$537.)

EVIDENCE IN HOMES, GOLF COURSES

Evidence of how this great growth in real buying power has bettered the lot of the citizen is abundant. It's found in homes and on highways, in bowling alleys and on golf courses. It shows in bookstores and concert halls. And—for the sick—in hospitals.

The 48 million new U.S. autos made in the last 8 years alone add up to twice as many cars as there are today on all the roads of Europe (including Russia). Once-a-week bowlers in the United States, now at 36 million, double the total of 1955. The golfing army has grown 25 percent.

The leap of living standards goes beyond the enjoyment of material things. Columbia Records reports the recording of classical music is the fastest growing part of its business—up 80 percent from the year earlier period in the first half of 1962. Book sales over \$1.2 billion yearly, are twice the 1955 total. The number of persons now entering hospitals is nearly half again as large as in the mid-1950's.

Growth of consumer products has accelerated sharply in recent years.

The table below shows U.S. production of some familiar goods. The postwar years, starting with 1947, have been divided into two 8-year periods to match recent output against that in the supposedly fast-growing early years. Total for 1955-62 include full-

year estimates for this year. Figures are in millions of units:

	Output in—	
	1955-56	1947-54
Autos.....	48.4	40.6
TV sets.....	51.9	37.7
Washing machines.....	30.8	29.0
Air conditioners.....	12.6	3.2
Clothes dryers.....	10.6	3.3
Dishwashers.....	3.9	1.6

The quantity of goods produced in the more recent 8-year span, in every case, exceeds the earlier output. In two instances—air conditioners and clothes dryers—1955-62 production is more than three times the 1947-54 total.

And the list doesn't include many items not even produced in the early years. Examples: Washer-dryer combination appliances (100,000 units sold by manufacturers last year), electric can openers (1.7 million), electric knife sharpeners (500,000), and tape recorders (500,000).

OUTSTRIPS POPULATION RISE

The great burst of consumer goods production in recent years far outpaces the population rise. Since 1955, the U.S. population has increased 12 percent. But the number of motor vehicles in use, for example, has climbed 24 percent. Some 8 million families own more than one auto now, nearly double the 1955 total.

Witness the rise of television in recent years: Nine of 10 homes have sets today, up from seven in 10 in 1955.

Or clothes dryers: Nearly a quarter of U.S. households are now equipped with them, up from 6 percent in 1955.

Or beef consumption: Per capita, Americans ate 67 pounds of it last year, a 12-pound jump from the 1955 average.

The home-building surge—over 10 million new homes in less than 8 years—has reduced "doubling up" among families. In 1955, about 1.5 million married couples were without homes of their own and had to live with relatives or others. The total now is close to 900,000.

And homes are getting bigger. Floor space in a new single-family home averages about 1,500 square feet, a third more space than the average new home contained in 1955.

DEPRESSING DEMAND?

Paradoxically, the great boom in things for consumers has caused some fears that consumers now possess so many items there is little room for continuing strong demand.

Many economists, however, believe such concern is unwarranted. Norris O. Johnson, vice president and economist of First National City Bank, New York, puts it this way:

"Human wants are insatiable. If the old worries about people having everything were valid, our economy would still be in the horse-and-buggy stage."

Living-standard growth through access to more so-called services has been sweeping.

A dramatic example: U.S. hospitals last year handled a record 25.5 million admissions. That's about 40 percent above the mid-1950's level.

To supply the growing wants of Americans, U.S. industry has carried out a vast expansion in recent years. Industry's massive ability to produce has prompted some concern about "excessive" capacity. But it also has paved the way for fast growth in the years just ahead, many experts contend.

ELECTRICITY TO SPARE

Note the gigantic growth in facilities to generate labor-saving electricity. The country's generating capacity now exceeds 180

million kilowatts, that's nearly 70 million above the 1955 level.

"We have the capacity now to handle a 25-percent jump in demand," says an official of Edison Electric Institute, a trade group representing electric utility companies. In the mid-1950's, he estimates, generating capacity was only 15 to 20 percent higher than demand.

To increase and otherwise improve production, the Nation's manufacturers have pumped \$101.3 billion into new plant and equipment projects since 1955. That's some \$17 billion more than they spent for plant and equipment in the entire previous postwar era.

One result of such spending has been a 30-percent leap in production capacity in basic industries (metals, chemicals, petroleum, textiles, lumber, and cement) in the past 8 years. These industries as a whole are now using some 80 percent of their capacity, according to Government estimates, down from about 85 percent in 1955.

Rapidly rising research and development spending in recent years has laid the groundwork for further betterment in living standards. The \$50 billion so spent in the United States in the past 4 years is nearly double the sum spent in the previous 4 years. This spending has increased yearly, through recovery and recession, since totals first were compiled in 1954.

Much of the concern over "slow growth" in the United States centers in comparisons between the increase of gross national product (the market value of all goods produced and services performed) in the United States and in other lands.

GNP in the United States has risen only 2.7 percent annually since the middle of the last decade (after allowing for price increases), far below the comparable rise in some other lands.

But such comparisons can be misleading. Many foreign economies were smashed by World War II. All are expanding from levels far below the U.S. postwar base.

Japan's GNP, for instance, has soared over 130 percent since the mid-1950's, far steeper than the comparable rise of GNP in the United States. In absolute terms, however, the gap between the two nations has widened. U.S. GNP, at the year's start, was \$491.4 billion greater than that of Japan. Eight years ago, the U.S. lead was only \$342.6 billion. At last count U.S. GNP was more than 10 times Japan's.

"It's impossible to say for certain how fast we should expand—there's a tendency to pick a figure out of the air," asserts F. L. Simmons, vice president and economist of Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York. "The statements made, moreover, often reflect the political underpinnings of the speakers."

DON'T TREAD ON ME

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very thought-provoking essay by one of my constituents, Mr. John R. Randall, of Johnstown, Ohio. Mr. Randall has a great interest in history and government and has produced a very thought-provoking article which is very germane to the great debates and issues of the day. Under

unanimous consent, I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

DON'T TREAD ON ME

The flag of the Virginia patriots served as an inspiration and most appropriate symbol for this work.

Benjamin Franklin defended the rattlesnake symbol¹ and in so doing gave the following reasons: "That the rattlesnake is found only in North America; that among the ancients, serpents were considered possessed of wisdom and vigilance; that the rattlesnake does not attack without first giving warning; and that the number of rattles increases with age—hence the symbol was especially appropriate for the anticipated growth of the United States."

To the author it suggests steadfastness, and in addition it serves as a bridge to the past, to the time when liberty was something sought for and not assumed, to a time when individual and national freedom was a concept cherished and not an actuality to be compromised or conceded.

BACKGROUND

As we travel the road of life, we pass many mileposts but few of them have real significance when we take that long-studied look at our past and try to recall the really big things, the really important things in our life.

Sometimes—much to our surprise—the thing or things that have had the greatest cumulative impact on our thinking and our actions are things that, at the time of their occurrence, were minute and inconsequential.

There are many reasons for this. Our conscious mind is a great sifter (selecting only those thoughts we most desire to recall for ready reference and selection); or perhaps it is due to our innate ability to make a mountain out of a molehill or vice versa.

In any event, when I was 6 years old a friend of my father's, Mr. Harry Hager, gave me a little framed picture for a birthday present. This was not much of a gift, I thought at the time, but I dutifully hung it on my bedroom wall. There it remained through childhood and adolescence, and today it hangs on my den wall. This little picture, because of its message, is one of my most valued possessions. I would say, realizing the full scope of its meaning or message, it was a very important milestone in my life.

With the passage of time our sense of values change; or stated another way, as we become more disciplined, more mature, the more likely we are to comprehend the full significance, the true meaning of a simple statement. The wiser we become, the more experienced we become, the more we realize that size and complexity do not guarantee quality.

My first milestone is reproduced here for your benefit. Read into it what you will. Enjoy it and make it a milestone in your life—if you care to:

"It's easy to drift in the current swift,
Just lie in your boat and dream,
But in Nature's plan it takes a real man,
To paddle his boat upstream."

My second milestone came while I was an eighth grader at Franklin Junior High School, Columbus, Ohio, while studying Latin in a general language course taught by Miss Ethel Ewing.

Miss Ewing taught Latin and history and over the door to her classroom was the word "salve." To the uninstructed this word signified the mysterious, the formidable and the arduous labor usually associated with learning a foreign language. Like the subject matter she taught, Miss Ewing herself

¹ "The Flag of Our United States," by James A. Moss.

was thought of as a hard taskmaster, immovable and impersonal. Again I say, those were the thoughts of the uninstructed.

Once you passed through this door and the learning process began you learned the meaning of this word—"good day." You also learned that the teacher was warm and dedicated to her work and that she wanted all her pupils to acquire the same interest and enthusiasm for knowledge and language that she had, to know and appreciate this ancient language and how it influenced history and current events.

I had the enthusiasm, but insofar as I was concerned she had little else to work with. But I wasn't to be outdone by Caesar and his "Veni, Vidi, Vici." I, too, would have a motto.

My inspiration came the day of a surprise quiz on a day when I was woefully unprepared. I tried but knew I couldn't fool her; therefore, on my paper I merely wrote "Rursus Temptavi" and didn't sign my name. "I tried again."

My motto has become a part of my philosophy or my way of life from that day on. I am grateful that I met Miss Ewing and I owe much to the inspiring motto, that in times of distress or adversity, has buoyed my spirits, mustered my thoughts and energy for that one last try.

One might say at this point that I believe: One should try, should stand up for his convictions, and not be afraid to run against the current of opinion, prejudice, and apathy whenever and wherever the occasion demands it.

Another milestone came when I was 14—in the home of my Sunday school teacher, Miss Elizabeth Lehman, who for 30-odd years had been a missionary in China. Miss Lehman aroused my interest in religion and provided the other and most important part of the equation—belief in God and in His power that is available to you if you believe in Him and if you try to help yourself.

TODAY

Today, as always, the world abounds in problems, in crises, and the question comes to mind—is this any different than it ever was or are we simply more aware of what is happening throughout the world because of the vast communication and transportation complexes?

No doubt both observations are true. One thing is certain, there are more people in existence than ever before and they are more vocal and expressive. Distance and timelag are things of the past. Change is constant and sometimes sudden, sometimes violent.

This can be both a blessing and a curse depending on your outlook, but one thing is certain—it exists. Another thing is equally important. It does have a bearing on you—today and from this day forward.

We live in a fast, noisy, worrisome and wearisome or wonderful (here again depending on your outlook) world.

It is said that our world is on the verge of reverting to a dark age or entering a golden era. The cause and the direction is of our own (mankind's) making and the only question to be resolved is: Will 20th-century man be capable of the effort to turn this challenge in the favor of future generations or will he succumb and cast himself and civilization into oblivion?

Personally, I have confidence in man. I believe in his Creator. I believe man to be made in the image of God and that God intended man to master himself and the universe he inhabits.

A big job confronts man in his race for survival. He lives in a paradoxical society when he, as an individual, is confronted with enormous problems as his society is one of plenty and poverty, peace and war, life and death, sickness and health, growth and decay. On top of all this is man who for

years has witnessed his individual identity eroding (sometimes at his insistence); his dependence on others increasing and then subjected to disillusionment when he discovers those in whom he placed his trust, his dependence, failed him.

It's a chaotic scene; but out of chaos comes order—the first law of the universe. Man will find order when he rediscovers his confidence and once again sets out on the path of mastery his Creator intended him to follow.

All of mankind's history has been but a prelude for the great play now being enacted. This play has a cast of billions but only two stars and it plays to one critic.

The play is life; the cast the world's inhabitants; the stars good and evil or Godlike and Godless; the critic, your Creator.

The plot is economic or materialistic with variations. On one hand we have good playing, its theme stressing the importance of man and human dignity; and on the other we have evil making her point of the importance of the system as opposed to the individual. You are soon to go on—soon to be counted. From whence will you make your entry—the right or left wing? You choose now and live, die, and be judged by your decision. Will it be from the right—aligned with God in support of individual human dignity, or from the left—denying God and favoring "a materialistic" system and the denial of man, his freedoms, his individuality?

EDUCATION

Not long ago, sputnik was launched and with its every orbit cries arose in this country to modify our educational system and its content. What we really need is more concentration. Concentration of study in the sciences, concentration of administrative responsibility, increased appropriations, and bigger and better facilities. "Off with the old, on with the new." Russia's being first meant American education's failure. How idiotic.

Few outcries are made today. Perhaps the system isn't so bad. The old decentralized system, the one that lets nature's law work, with a minimum of impairment—the law referred to is: "Water seeks its own level."

Let's take a look at the subject of education. In this country of ours, education is a basic necessity if our system of self-government is to be maintained. It goes without saying in a democracy or a federal republic the public must be knowledgeable if they are to exercise their franchise intelligently and be productive members of their society.

Is our educational system currently as good as it should be or could be? I think not. Is our shortage of college facilities as real as it is reported to be? I think not. Should we segregate the brilliant from the average and the average from the slow student? I think not. Should the determination of curriculums in our schools, the administration of building and maintenance funds be determined at the Federal level? I think not. Should parochial schools be subsidized in any way by any government agency at any level? I think not.

Perhaps the above sounds negative, but let's explore these areas one at a time—just briefly—and see if the above stands or beliefs make sense.

Our educational system could be improved in many ways. The first step in improving the efficiency and productivity of our educational system is for every adult to take an interest in it with the idea in mind of ascertaining what problems are facing school administrators, teachers, pupils, employers, and last but not least, the taxpayers. When was the last time you visited your school during school hours, during an open house, during a PTA or PTO meeting? How long has it been since you attended the last school board meeting? Did you vote for your

school board members or trustees? Were you satisfied with their background or did you just vote for a name? These men and women in a very real and final sense determine the effectiveness and cost of maintaining your school or schools.

Let's face it. If we are too apathetic to take an active interest in our local schools—here's where most of your real estate taxes go and more—then how can we possibly understand the problem at the national level let alone supporting or offering a solution to resolve the problem? In the final analysis, the biggest problem confronting our educators today is the lack of adult support or understanding of the school program. This part of the problem can be solved for nothing—except your time. Everyone should take an interest in education in their community whether or not they have children in school. I shudder when I think of living in a community where education was thought unnecessary or a waste of time. In a matter of time neither your person nor your property would be safe and your community would soon die.

Is the shortage or anticipated shortage of college classrooms real or fancied? Yes and no. Yes; if we are to run every young man and woman through them regardless of their fitness or qualifications. No, if we are to operate a college system in the classical sense—for those sufficiently endowed intellectually. One of our greatest mistakes today from a standpoint of quality, cost, and social significance is the idea that everyone must go to college. Forcing college attendance on our youth is morally and economically wrong.

Society—parents especially—does a grave injustice to our youth when they send them off to college when they are not prepared for it intellectually or when the young people do not care to seriously undertake a course of study in the arts and sciences.

The college degree is becoming meaningless because it is becoming so essential as a status symbol and in the quest for employment. Business creates a wasteful and meaningless standard when they demand a degree for a clerk's job. Whom are they kidding? They're only kidding themselves because they force academic standards down to a level that makes a degree obtainable by almost anyone who has the patience to sit through 4 years of a high school rehash. Who loses? We all lose. The student loses time—in many cases—that could be better spent learning a vocation or trade or otherwise getting education.

The taxpayer loses because this adds to the cost of maintaining an extremely expensive educational plant. Our economy loses because the dollars so spent have not been productive dollars and this is vital in a free enterprise society—every person, every dollar must be productive in a real way if we are to win the real battle against communism—the economic and ideological battle.

Everyone loses—and this can be the most tragic loss—if the student breaks and becomes neurotic and morose. This loss is impossible to calculate.

Why don't we face up to the fact that every job doesn't require a degree. Let's not kid ourselves by saying a college degree is an end in itself. Let's not—I pray—make labor and work degrading but let us encourage our youth—all of our citizens to pursue that vocation that their talents can best be used in and in which they'll find contentment and the satisfaction of being productive.

The time has come to carefully examine the use of our high schools on a two shift basis or around the clock if need be and offer advanced courses—junior college level or trade school courses to prepare our clerks, et cetera. This approach offers many real opportunities for good—social, economic as well as educational.

Should we segregate the brilliant students from the average and slow students in public schools? No. What we should strive for in educating our youth is balance—the equal development of minds, bodies, and personalities. By association with their slower associates, the extremely bright student can help lift the level of aspiration and accomplishment of the entire class or group and at the same time he can learn patience and understanding, to say the least.

Another facet of this, one of the most important or most discussed topics of public education is the cost of this type of segregation. I think this a burden costwise, that the public should not be forced to bear. Many people will find this objectionable as they feel the bright, the gifted child has a far greater potential for social good than the average or slow students. This may be true but think of the number or percentage of this type of student as opposed to the balance and the consequence of this action when you think of the damage done to the average or slow student by his being labeled in a negative way, early in life. This labeling is extremely damaging and it is sad that "labels" are being used so extensively in our society and many times without thought to their consequences.

Insofar as the Federal Government is concerned it should not in any way interfere with public education at any level. This principle is clearly and concisely stated in our Constitution. Local problems—local solutions should be the benchmark in our educational system.

Federal or public support of parochial schools is strictly taboo in our society and it is best that the principle of segregation of church and state be maintained lest confusion arise and freedoms be abridged because the will of one is forced on the other or on society itself. A free lunch or a free ride is not worth sacrificing so great a principle, now or ever.

THE ECONOMY

"Baa, baa, black sheep,
Have you any wool?
Yes sir, yes sir;
Three bags full.
One for the master,
One for the dame,
One for the little boy
Who cries in the lane."

Nursery rhyme? Not originally. A bit of satire protesting oppressive taxation in a time when freedom of speech and criticism of government was not permitted.

Today our economy is lagging behind that of other free countries in Western Europe and our President's economic advisers are desperately floundering about trying to find the answer; however, the solution to the problem has long been known and advocated but the "eggheads" can't grasp the concept because it is so obvious, so simple, and so effective, and offers less of a haven for "spoilors" and bureaucrats.

It seems the "experts" have learned little while driving this great Nation to the abyss of bankruptcy. They have recently advocated a revision of their basic premise. Albeit the reasons for this are to take advantage of the taxpayer's basic dislike of Federal taxes and the usurpation of his income, his purchasing power, and his savings. It is offered to gain his favor, his vote, and thereby propagate and perpetuate their grasp or death grip on his destiny. They have dropped the tax, half of their panacea of tax and spend. Now the whole scheme is merely spend, spend, spend.

Spend what? The only money the Government has to spend is the money the citizenry permits it to usurp from them through taxation. Of course there is always credit but this presents a stumbling block to the spenders in time because even the lenders to Government are apt to ask for justifica-

tion on the basis of character, capacity, and collateral.

The sad truth is the time has come when this hurdle must be overcome or the bubble will burst.

As a matter of fact, today, if the collective foreign demand on our gold reserves was exercised we would be adrift. Like a ship at sea without a rudder—friendless and lost—with no friendly beach on the horizon.

You think this can't happen? You are wrong. This dilemma has caused many sleepless nights in financial circles the world over in recent months and still we continue plodding along not caring and oblivious to reality.

This is exactly what "Khru" predicted would happen. He knew he could depend on the selfishness, the greed, and the apathy of the American electorate to bring about its own destruction. We failed to learn from history that democratic societies usually destroy themselves from within and not fall to their obvious enemies from without. The "good life" does not come free—enslavement does.

This is an emergency. What's the solution—if there is one? We have the question before us. Let's explore the possibilities—just a few of them.

No. 1: Let's assume, if you haven't been convinced already, that a huge and domineering Federal bureaucracy is the cause. Before we go any further, the responsibility is yours and mine.

Let's look at this again a little closer just to make sure—we don't want to start down the wrong path. Again, our major trouble is too much Government and the cause of this is the apathy, the greed, and the transference of responsibility by the electorate—starting with you and me. We haven't fulfilled our responsibility as citizens and we haven't expected our leaders to do any better.

Now, for many years our Federal Government has been trying to fill the gap created by our apathy and a few—give the people responsible for our leadership the benefit of the doubt—tyrants, power hungry, and in some cases outright gangsters and subversives have ambitiously sought to grab all the "marbles" or as many as possible for themselves and in so doing exercise absolute control over our lives from the cradle to the grave.

Their progress has exceeded their wildest expectations and we have played our role to perfection. We have asked for more, while at the same time we decided to do less and less. In this situation all that was asked was a small part of our birthright with each giveaway. This we gladly gave—it cost us little or nothing and think of the returns. "Easy come, easy go."

As always, there is an answer but the price is greater, the cure more costly, than it would have been 30 years ago.

The first thing we must do is return to some of the basic facts of life—morally, politically, and economically. We must again face up to the fact that waste must be eliminated. Waste of our natural, human, and economic resources, featherbedding, extravagance, "pork barreling," excessive Government spending, and excessive taxation must be a thing of the past—immediately. Confidence must be restored.

This will result in victory on every front and increase the stature of mankind globally.

Cuts in expenditures must come first. Taxation can be revised downward slowly but the cost of debt reduction must be set at a faster pace. The size and scope of Federal control and business activity must shrink.

What follows from this course? People in nonproductive and wasteful endeavors will be forced to seek employment in productive enterprises (there will be plenty of opportunities for them when the reduction in taxation takes the burden off John Q. Pub-

lic—who has tremendous, insatiable propensity to consume goods and services) and the cost of these people and the programs that employ them will be diverted to the economy for use in expansion and improvement of our industrial plant which will be required as a result of more disposable income in the hands of millions of American consumers—the working men and women of America.

To give the economy an immediate boost, we should eliminate the practice of withholding Federal income tax from the paychecks of the millions of Americans who usually have the entire amount refunded or at least a large portion of it. Let's put this money in circulation where it should be now.

The impact would be tremendous and immediate, and confidence—consumer and investor confidence—would be buoyed. Confidence is what expands a nation's growth rate, not government spending for public works projects and other made work and stopgap measures. The man on the street realizes this endless process of declaring, collecting, and returning tax moneys is costly and detrimental to the economy—odd that the experts can't see it. Too obvious, no doubt, or too unsophisticated. We are foolish if we don't eliminate withholding taxes and reap the benefits that accrue from more jobs and a lot more confidence. We should seek more confidence and demand less control.

If this sounds reasonable to you, look for candidates for the Congress, the Senate, and the Presidency who agree and are dedicated to the belief that the average man (the one who assumes the tax burden), woman and child believes in human dignity, that the average or majority of Americans if given the money now surrendered to the Federal Government would welcome the opportunity to meet their current and future needs—Independently—for education, medical care, and retirement, etc.

RACE RELATIONS

More articles in the Constitution are devoted to this subject and its salient ramifications (arts. XIII, XIV, and XV) than any other and yet every time a politician wants an issue—a real votegetter and support winner—he pulls this issue out of his hat. It is very much with us today.

With all of this smoke there must be a little fire and more than sufficient reason to explore it.

This is a moral issue and certainly the framers of the Declaration of Independence—even though some were slave owners—had a great moral truth in mind when in the preamble they set forth our doctrine, "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that to assure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, etc."

This was the first tangible evidence that supports the line of reasoning that the United States of America was truly a land of prophecy in a very real sense. Certainly the Creator's hand was and is reflected in this.

After so noble a start, why should race relations, segregation, and discrimination be so much in the news and politics of the day?

Few people would deny this principle but many would qualify it and interpret its "true meaning" or the meaning that the writers of the preamble had in mind when they wrote it.

Personally, I accept it *prima facie*. If this cannot be done, then any part of the Declaration of Independence and much of the Constitution can be "explained away," leaving only the empty shell wherein the hope of all mankind once resided.

This issue has been kept alive for the following basic reasons: greed (politicians), ignorance (general public), and the minority groups own defeatist, self-pitying attitude.

This seems to be an endless problem politically, socially, and economically because many opportunists are feeding on it—opportunists of all racial extractions.

In keeping with our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, this issue should be considered on a personal basis under the broadest interpretation of the highest laws of our land and the Supreme Law of the Universe.

Let's not degrade any individual or group of individuals because of the slothful or seemingly undesirable mode of conduct of some of the members of their race. Keeping in mind that as a society we are responsible in large measure for their inability to find employment and the educational opportunities necessary to improve their lot, enjoy the good life and become useful, productive citizens.

Simplification, not legislation, is the key—person to person acceptance and a personal desire to seek understanding will resolve this problem.

Keep in mind your own rights when you would abridge the rights of others.

LABOR

This vital area of our economy and society is one of the most paradoxical and hard to understand.

Complacency and greed brought it into being and love and brotherhood were its nutrients, but as strange as it may seem it appears that the complacency today is that of the union members, the greed is that of the union bosses or leaders and not owners or management. Love today is that of political bosses and the brotherhood seems to be that of the gangsters and labor pros. Stranger than fiction, isn't it, but true?

We have come a long way since families were self-sufficient, since the earlier days of the industrial revolution, since child and female labor were "exploited," since the days of the Pinkerton "goon squads," from the days of idealism in the union movement and days of overwork and underpay.

We must now hold labor accountable as it is mature and mighty and must assume the vital and responsible role it is expected to play in a free enterprise society. Labor must now do more than demand. It must pay. It must contribute in a real sense to increased productivity and social awareness. It must truly represent its members and not the selfish interests of its leaders and hangers on. It must exclude itself from the political scene where it feeds the caprices of selfish bigots and aspiring politicians. It must rid itself of the gangster element and the scavengers that through their selfishness and ignorance will bring it into disrepute and render it ineffective as a bargaining agent for the honest and hard working members whose faith and finances have made it the power that it is.

THE FARM FANTASY

In the 1960 general election, there was one mandate given by the electorate. "Get the Government out of agriculture." This mandate is reflected in the election of those Congressmen and Senators who campaigned against a federally subsidized, federally controlled farm program in those States where agriculture is a basic industry, in those States that furnish the bulk of the food and fiber of this great Nation, the areas that are responsible for our leadership in agricultural productivity.

In light of this mandate, why do we find ourselves constantly besieged by solutions by the present administration? The American farmer has been laboring under the weight of Government solutions since the enactment of the AAA in 1933 and he wants no more of them. He has had—more than

any other segment of our economy—been the victim of control for 30 years and knows better than anyone else how ridiculous, how wasteful, and how inefficient bureaucratic planning and operations really are.

Still we continue down the path of planning to oblivion. What is our motivation? Certainly one must wonder. Certainly the experts can't have the best interests of the Nation at heart. It must, therefore, be for purely selfish and political reasons.

Perhaps it was because of an intense desire on the part of the New Dealers to sway the electorate in those historically Republican States to elect Democratic candidates to the House and Senate of the United States and thereby facilitate the passage of legislation that would make possible a planned economy, "a welfare state"—a Utopia—wherein the citizenry would be planned for, controlled, and provided for from the cradle to the grave, that it got its start. The New Deal has passed from the scene, the Fair Deal too, but now in the New Frontier we are still confronted with this issue—more intensely than ever before. It reminds me of the lyrics "the song is ended but the melody lingers on."

Our surplus in agriculture is a nightmare—physically and fiscally—and yet the bureaucrats stick to their guns. Government planning and Government control is the answer. The problem now is how to get more control over the entire economy, in the hopes of covering the "goofs" made in one area. If they could only control distribution and consumption as well as production and storage, they could solve the problem. The farmer is cognizant of this line of reasoning and he has been quite outspoken about it, but his remonstrations, his pleas have fell on deaf ears—except for the career "goofers" and the administration, Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman in particular.

Freeman laid his cards on the table when he addressed the Farm Bureau Federation in Chicago in 1961. In an effort to stifle the Farm Bureau's vehement opposition, he reportedly said, "You'd better go along with my program of farm management and increased controls or we will dump our surpluses on the market and ruin you." Hardly the sentiment of a benefactor, but in the true form of a demagogue. The next step in this chain of events is for the Government to act without the citizenry having benefit of even making a token expression. In polite society, they call this some kind of an *ism* but I would call it hell.

Let's examine this agriculture problem arithmetically. Believe me, it is of astronomical proportions—out of 2,258,000 civilian employees on the Federal payroll, we find 102,557 nestled under the wing of the Secretary of Agriculture (this does not include an equal sized army of "conservationists," etc.).

We have 3,710,228 farms, or 1 Agriculture Department employee for every 37 farms. Cash farm receipts from farm marketings were \$34,013,666,000 in 1960 and in addition to this, the Agriculture Department kicked in \$693,087,000 through some of its various payment programs—of this \$369,953,000 was paid out through the soil bank program.

The soil bank, this is where the rub comes in, has proven to be a bonanza for almost everyone—including insurance companies, banks, corporations, doctors, lawyers, engineers, ad infinitum—as they have all shared in the benefits of a program designed and implemented to help the farmer. The point is this—you don't have to be a farmer to get a cut out of the USDA pie. Just buy some land and sooner or later you'll be getting a check from Uncle Sam.

The 1961 budget made provision for agricultural expenditures of \$5,954,069,674. By comparison, our mining industry produced only \$5,516 million in 1960 and in the same year, our lumber industry produced only \$5,065 million and our automobile industry \$8,387 million.

Now let's compare this to some revenue figures. In 1960 the Federal Government collected \$3,193,714,000 from alcohol taxes and \$1,931,504,000 from tobacco taxes.

Historically we have hated taxes—people through the ages have hated taxes. Our Revolution was really fought because of taxes. As a matter of fact, we might have still been British subjects if King George had a little different attitude toward taxing us or if he realized the limit he could go before a fellow like Patrick Henry, down in Virginia, would stand up and say "Give me liberty or give me death" and in the same speech say "If this be treason, make the most of it."

What have we come to when we pay the hated taxes to Government and instead of being used to defray the legitimate cost of Government or being applied to the reduction of the national debt, it is used as an incentive to encourage people not to work, not to produce, and further increase the cost of Government?

To say this is fantastic is not enough. This type of fiscal policy is inconceivable in the 20th century when we are fighting for our very lives—for this to happen and for it to be common knowledge and our citizenry to sit idly by means only one thing—the citizens of this great Nation really don't give a damn and perhaps they justly deserve the end that surely awaits them—enslavement.

If the amount of money collected in the alcohol and tobacco taxes was returned in the economy, look at the good it would do; look at the jobs it would create; the contribution it would make toward resolving our unemployment problem. Now think of the answer, the mandate given by the farmers themselves—"Get the Government out of agriculture."

What do the farmers mean when they say "Get the Government out of agriculture"? They mean that they want their freedom. Freedom to plant or not to plant; freedom to market or not to market. Briefly stated, they want the freedom to use their property as they see fit without an abridgement of their rights to do so as outlined in our Constitution.

What would happen if farm subsidies were withdrawn systematically and the law of supply and demand allowed to function freely and establish the volume of production of goods and their prices? One thing for sure would happen—the cost of Government would go down and farm efficiency would go up.

No doubt many so-called farmers, the beneficiaries of the parity system, would withdraw from farming and just continue to work at their regular job in town. Other farmers would expand their operations by buying the land the fellows mentioned above vacated and they would make greater capital expenditures for equipment, etc. (this creates jobs, not deficits), because they would have a greater productive capacity to pay for it. Other farmers would specialize. That is to say, they would go into grain programs, feeder programs, dairy or poultry programs exclusively and not mix or vary their programs as they do today to take advantage of parity, price supports, no work and no production incentives. The end result would be better quality, balanced production, lower prices, more profitable farmers and happy, healthier, less harassed consumers. In finance there is a law—Gresham's law—and I think it applies equally as well in farming, "cheap money drives out good money," by substituting we get "Government supported marginal farmers who bring about the control of the agriculture industry drive out the efficient farmer."

When we get the Federal Government out of farming, who will guide the farmer and keep the farming industry from falling and with it the economy? We still have a Committee on Agriculture in the House and Senate and their membership is knowledgeable

enough to prevent any slippage of dire consequences. In addition, we have our extensive agricultural programs carried on at the State level by our colleges and universities—especially our land-grant colleges—not to mention the myriad of farm co-operatives, feeder associations, and organizations like the Farm Bureau Federation. These organizations do a tremendous job today advising and informing their members and could do an even greater job with the farmers—as they are close to him in interest and physically—if they didn't have so much USDA redtape to restrict and retard them.

Farmers and their associations have done a lot already on their own initiative to alleviate the surplus problem we are faced with. For example, the wheatgrowers have on their own initiative attempted to increase the wheat consumption in Japan and other free world countries where wheat and bread are not the diet staples that they are here. They have done an excellent job in some countries by encouraging the use of wheat and wheat products in school lunch programs.

In summary, by reducing the Federal Government's role in agricultural spending, we could conceivably make an appreciable increase in the growth rate of our gross national product because the diversion of funds from the Government to the consumer would expand the demand for goods and services. This would create more jobs which in turn would cut unemployment and this would result in reduced outlays by Government for various and sundry welfare programs. "Get the Government out of agriculture."

FOREIGN POLICY

Our basic foreign policy should be re-examined, reevaluated, and restated in a concise statement that everyone, here and abroad, can understand and appreciate. This statement should be direct and to the point. Once given, it should be adhered to and not deviated from until the world is free and communism obliterated.

I recommend that our policy be stated along the following lines: the foreign policy of the Government of the United States is to achieve victory over communism in every corner of the world—economically, politically, and in warfare if need be; to aid and assist enslaved and emerging nations in every practical way to achieve and maintain national independence and to work with them in establishing and maintaining free governments and self-sustaining economies; to work toward the objective of establishing personal freedom and individual dignity for all mankind; to promote and preserve world peace and progress.

We are long overdue in the establishment of a dynamic and meaningful foreign policy. This has hurt us and the resultant damage is incalculable.

No doubt there are many reasons for this, but certainly naivete and immaturity must head the list, followed closely by fear.

We have been naive in many ways. Naive to think the Communists are earnestly seeking peace, promoting good, and desirable as members of a free society—any society. The time has come to face up to reality. We can no longer tolerate their evil and we must immediately take broad, sweeping, and effective steps to counteract the damage they have done and are doing.

Our naivete has permitted the Communists to poison the minds of educators, writers, government officials, labor leaders, social workers, lawyers, doctors, engineers, entertainers, servicemen, and citizens throughout the world for over 40 years through their efforts in degrading and defaming the basic institutions of a free and moral society. We stood idly by while they spread their vermin. Stood by while they destroyed or attempted to destroy all that is good in society today, especially the concept of individual dignity and civil rights.

This is, in large measure, due to the fact that their philosophy and behavior is so repugnant to the average man that he finds it difficult to comprehend how any thinking individual could subscribe to it. Maybe so. But the thing to remember is this: The Communists seldom act in an outward and obvious manner. They don't come out with banners flying, trumpets blaring, but as thieves in the night and usually with some dupe-a-dupe, who is usually respected and revered in his society, doing their bidding.

Don't be mistaken by their subtlety as they can be and usually are so base and sadistic that it defies the imagination of any healthy, thinking individual. They are determined, ruthless, flexible, patient, and to top it all off, they know that free men are usually apathetic, and they depend on us—yes, you and I—to further their cause by being apathetic, appeasing, and wishy-washy in our conduct.

If you think they aren't a menace, if you think they are fit to exist in society, take a quick glimpse at their record and their objectives, bearing in mind they have enslaved a third of the world's population and a fourth of the area of the world.

A symbol of their system and its unworthiness is the Berlin wall. Created to keep the starved and economically destitute members of their Utopian society in subjugation.

With all of their controls, mental, physical, economic, and political, they have yet to extinguish the spark of freedom and spirituality in the hearts of their slaves and they have made a determined, fanatical effort to do so since their inception.

Now you are saying the above recital proves they are inadequate and not to be feared. Better think it through. The sad truth is this: they have made such terrific inroads in our own and other free world societies that nothing positive, nothing really effective can, or is, being done to undo the damage done by them.

Let's stop here and take a quick glimpse at our society and what makes the above statement more easy to comprehend. The basic premise of our Nation, our society, is that man—made in God's image—is supreme. That government is a by-product of man's association with other men—"governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

It follows that the first objective of the Communists everywhere must be to destroy this image of man and his confidence in himself and the basic institutions of his society if they are to succeed in their goal of world enslavement.

This technique has been most successful for they have made great progress here. First, they have convinced many that man cannot master himself, let alone his destiny. They have made materialism the objective of his life as opposed to spiritualism and as a result, government has grown, and conversely, the importance of man has diminished. At this point, the basic premise of our philosophy has had a severe jolt.

With man reduced to a mere statistic, we find that they are really underway because now we have man controlled by government and without confidence in himself. The next step is to convince this mass of proto-plasm—they think of man as nothing more—that the institutions of his society are meaningless. Here again, government grows and as stated before, man dedicated to materialism, lacking in confidence, will permit them to take over now that he has arrived at the point of no return, where government is supreme and he has lost faith in it. He is ready to sacrifice the balance of his birthright—and there is little of it left at

this point—to the system, any system, capable of usurping the last vestige of human dignity from him with an empty promise of bread and circuses—economic security.

Exit free man. Exit God.

Sounds gloomy. When one stands on the threshold of oblivion, he is not in a happy state of mind. Remorse, anger, and indignation fill his soul—he is ashamed, saddened to think he has, or nearly has, destroyed himself. If he has time, he so reasons, but there is not always time—"tempus fugit."

In our case, there is time, just enough, I hope, to shore up our confidence and re-energize ourselves spiritually for the job ahead. There are signs. In the past there have been signs but we have ignored them. Now we must act positively, correctly, and without hesitation.

Before we embark upon the project of "liberating" the world, we must rediscover ourselves, we must reacquaint ourselves with the principles and philosophy that have been responsible for our growth, our progress—for the establishment of the most desired and most rewarding social system man has ever known.

Simultaneously, we must orient ourselves in the world. We must define or determine its current status, its needs—present and long range—and relate our activities to the achievement of those goals and objectives that will enhance mankind's understanding of his total environment and the opportunities for his enjoyment of it.

Politically, this must be a bipartisan determination because bipartisanism will give a degree of perpetuity to our foreign affairs—an essential ingredient if our policy is to be understood and depended upon by every nation. A part of our growing up that is urgently needed is the understanding that foreign policy, knowledge of every nation's foreign policy, is vital, especially in those countries which border on hostile or quasi-hostile foreign countries. We tend to lose sight of this important principle because of the relationship of each of our States to the Nation and the good neighbors we have to our north and the south. This has been a glaring failure of our policy for years—no one could count on our policy from one day to the next.

Foreign aid or assistance must not necessarily imply economic and military aid. Dollars and obsolete military hardware are poor substitutes for compassion, understanding, genuine friendliness, and the creation of an environment where nations can enjoy friendly intercourse and the exchange of ideas, goods, and services—especially on a person to person basis.

Governments (in ours with Senate approval) make treaties and otherwise establish the framework within which their respective citizens can contribute on the international level. This is essential as individuals cannot and should not make foreign policy but it's the people that make it work or fail to work in large measure.

If ever a nation should have learned the fallacy of monetary (dollar) diplomacy, it should have been the United States. Billions upon billions of American dollars have been sent abroad to help less fortunate nations and peoples to achieve a better life or to maintain their freedom. At least that was the intent or the purpose the American people had in mind when they gladly gave it. But the failure came about when we assumed dollars would or could do it all and do it alone. In foreign affairs, the attitudes of the citizenry of the nation helped and helping are of equal importance to the aid itself.

One question we must ask ourselves, "Has our foreign aid always done the beneficial job for the recipient people that the American citizen intended it to do?" Quite frankly, we must admit our efforts have fallen short of this noble objective. Many

millions, perhaps billions, of dollars have gone into the personal bank accounts of foreign despots and has in no way contributed to the improvement of the living standards of our intended beneficiaries. This proves quite embarrassing when we ask these people, or tell the world how much we helped them, and then, much to our surprise and their harassment, find there has been no realistic American aid. No aid—only resentment.

Another factor we must keep in mind is that foreign and domestic policy cannot be entirely disassociated as a matter of fact; fiscally they must be or should be complementary. As a general rule, our foreign policy must be articulate, goals and objectives must be spelled out, and costs realistically determined, and last but not least, results should be expected and accountability enforced.

For example, whenever we appropriate a vast sum of money for highway improvement projects or similar public works programs abroad, we should first review the plans and specifications—having previously ascertained the real need for the project—to see if they are realistic; next we should ascertain the cost of the project based on actual bids; and finally we should not authorize payment for the work until it has been completed—at least by phases—to the satisfaction of our Corps of Engineers or State Department representatives.

The concept of aiding and abetting pro-Communist regimes through food handouts, etc., should be discontinued immediately. I agree it is moral to relieve sickness and starvation wherever and whenever it occurs if we possibly can, but on the other side of the coin it is equally immoral to save a social system or government from failing by these generous acts—humanitarian acts—when the ultimate objective of these systems or governments is the enslavement of their own people or ultimately us. The principle of positive expected results in foreign aid is dramatically pointed up in these situations.

The Peace Corps in my mind is the ultimate in foreign aid and assistance if it is carried out to its logical conclusion and on a nonpartisan basis—nonpartisan as to membership, indoctrination, and in leadership.

In this type of aid or assistance, the people being aided are aided in a direct and personal manner in a most positive way. They are being taught to help themselves by people who are definitely and personally interested in them. Every American should be proud of our Peace Corps volunteers and the work they are doing. Everyone of us should support and encourage them in their efforts as they are bearing our cross in the remote and lonely areas of the world and in many cases alone, insofar as other Americans are concerned, and under extreme pressures.

One way we can help them is by writing them while abroad and offering them encouragement. Another way is to encourage returning Peace Corps volunteers to visit our schools and various meetings to show us the pictures and slides they prepared while abroad and relate to us their impressions, etc. And those of us who travel abroad can help immeasurably by conducting ourselves in such a manner that our activities and conduct reflect breeding, understanding, and decency to all those who see us.

We can and should reinforce the Peace Corps efforts in the area of education by following up and assisting these people to become economically self-sustaining; here again, on a person-to-person, State-to-Nation basis, without a vast expenditure of Federal tax moneys. We private American citizens have great capacity for charity and understanding and through our efforts to help others we can in large measure realize the fullness of life that our Creator intended all mankind to enjoy.

² Preamble of the Declaration of Independence.

Economically, we can benefit, and all the free world, because as the standard of living in these remote and densely populated areas increases, the greater their needs will be for goods and services. From this they become partners in trade and not aid and this is what develops people and adds new heights to their level of aspirations. Aid—outright, continued dole—is a depressant. Both to the donor and donee. Think this over and I'm sure you will agree.

In summary, our foreign policy should be firm and positive—we have the best product (way of life in the world) to offer people—we should strive to help others help themselves and we must truly represent as citizens to the world the mode of behavior and conduct at home and abroad that exemplifies the American way of life. Finally, we must confess to ourselves and the world "dollars can't do it"—and shouldn't be expected to.

DON'T TREAD ON ME

The spirit of Patrick Henry is evident in the land again.

Yes; Americans for the first time in 30 years are coming to the realization that excessive taxation and government license are not a panacea.

The 30-year era of graft, gifts, and goofs is drawing to an end. The taxpayer, the voter, has had enough of big government, big bosses, and big blunders. He is concerned about his freedoms—which have been eroding for 30 years, he is concerned about the direction, the purpose, and the integrity of his government and its advisers. Unlike his forebears who resorted to war, today's "minutemen" will revolt at the polls.

In a democracy or democratic Republic the apathy of the electorate is axiomatic. It is the system's greatest weakness, it is the path of destruction unless and until the electorate blows the whistle and exclaims: "Don't tread on me."

In a "free enterprise" society, the basis of its philosophy is economic—predicated on the assumption that price and production are dependent upon "supply and demand in the marketplace."

It's more than that. It's a system based on law—moral law or, if you will, the fusion of Mosaic law, Roman law, and English law. It is a system that assumes and assures that its citizenry are more than animals. Morality and human dignity are the bulwark of the free enterprise society. A society in which honor, trust, and fidelity are a must.

Another facet of this, the most wonderful of all systems, is productivity, productivity of labor, land, and capital. The system depends on this; without it, it couldn't exist. Here is another crucial or perhaps a fatal pitfall of our type of society—the kind of society based on freedom and plenty. In our plenitude we are susceptible to greed, waste, hypocrisy, and again apathy. The good life with attendant lack of value or loss of sense of value breeds contempt and insecurity.

Contempt for the things that made and make this type of society possible—the strength, moral, physical, and financial, of the individual citizen. The most obvious evidence of this type of decay is insecurity and the attendant extensionalism, extensionalism that finds expression in going without oneself or community for the answers, the guidance, the direction, and solutions. Here is where government grows, freedoms erode, and apathy sets in.

You don't get something for nothing. You always pay. If you are a coward, your reward is defeat; if you are slothful or without purpose, your reward is enslavement; and if you are apathetic, your reward is subjugation. What follows from your outlook or mode of behavior does not always come as a bolt out of the blue but as a thief in the night.

Many times the consequence is slow coming and unnoticed, as cancer; but it comes as surely as day follows night. This is sad, cruel. For if a sign appeared suddenly, a change would follow and more than likely, a change in attitude.

In our society the signs have appeared and they have gone unheeded, but now they are so obvious and glaring, they cannot be ignored if our way of life is to exist. The time for action and rededication is now—today.

Have we forgotten the basic fundamentals upon which this great Nation was founded? Our economic growth is being stifled. Why? Because we have forfeited much of our purchasing power to Government; we have sacrificed much of our labor force on the altar of bureaucracy and rendered it nonproductive and parasitic. We have created a monster—big government—and today many feel it is a hopeless dilemma, too hopeless to resolve. This is not true. A solution is at hand. All that is necessary is for each and every citizen to rededicate himself to the principles of self-determination and demand a reduction in Government expenditures. Remember, "good government begins with each individual citizen."

Don't expect something for nothing; don't tolerate government and its bureaucrats to make a mockery of our way of life by giving anyone something for "nothing." Remember: "The haves and have-nots can usually be traced to the dids and the did-nots."

Everyone in this great country of ours does not have all the essentials, let alone the luxuries they would like to have, and chances are they never will as long as we pay approximately 32 percent of our income to government. This in itself is a sign, a dramatic one, for a nation can be socialized as readily through taxation as through revolt, and when taxation is at a rate of 30 percent or more, socialism is a fact.

Socialism. Wake up, America. This utopian concept has been proven time and again to be fallacious. Look at England. Once a mighty power and world leader and now a weak dissipate half shell of a nation. Look at Germany and the dynamic recovery she has made. Even Khrushchev admits the communistic trend is toward a more democratic and individualistic form of society; this is of necessity. Socialism does not work as it is contrary to the basic nature of man.

We have what people through the ages have aspired to and we don't realize it. Let's not lose it through indifference and apathy. Longing for it once it's gone will never bring it back. When further encroachment is imminent, think of Patrick Henry and his reaction to taxes and impairment of civil liberties: "Give me liberty or give me death," and the flag many early patriots fought under and its caption: "Don't Tread on Me."

JOHN M. RANDALL.

NIGHTLY REPORTS ON CONGRESS OVER WMAL RADIO

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress draws to a close I would like to voice my appreciation of one of the most worthwhile services performed both for the Members of Congress and the people in the Washington area—the nightly reports on Congress by veteran corres-

pondent Joseph McCaffrey and his associate Les Higbie over WMAL radio.

Probably more Members of the House and Senate listen to these nightly reports than to any other radio or television program. This program, "Today in Congress," has become a listening habit since Mr. McCaffrey first put it on the air in 1958.

It is the best capsule review of the day's work of Congress available to Members, their staffs, and members of the executive departments, presented in a straightforward, nonpartisan way.

Having once been an on-air reporter myself, I admire the way Mr. McCaffrey picks out the meat of the day's happenings, both on the floor of both Houses and in the committees, and then reports it in a neat summary so that he is able to get in almost all of the day's most important developments.

I have often thought of the great value such a program would be to the people around the Nation if they had available to them Mr. McCaffrey's knowledgeable report each night on what their Representatives and Senators were doing. It would help link the Congress and the people and give the people a greater understanding, not only of the problems facing their National Legislature, but how the Congress and its Members are meeting, or not meeting, such problems.

Both Mr. McCaffrey and Mr. Higbie have won the respect and confidence of Members of Congress by their work on this program. The U.S. Savings & Loan League, which sponsored the program, is to be congratulated for its public spirited interest.

When we adjourn, as I hope we eventually will, "Today in Congress" will adjourn as well. But when we return here in January, I expect that "Today in Congress" will be back as well, keeping a close eye on what we do and reporting each night on how we do it.

FLORIDA CROSS STATE BARGE CANAL

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am asking in strongest terms that the budget recommendation for an appropriation item for the Florida Cross State Barge Canal be accepted. At the moment this may come to the House in one of two ways; either by action of the conference committee of the supplemental appropriations bill, or by action of the conference committee of the public works appropriations bill. In either event, I ask that the item for the completion of the preconstruction planning for this project be approved by the House. I am talking about a very small amount of money as appropriations go. This item is for \$205,000. It is a budget item. It came to us with the recommendation of the Kennedy administration. The President committed himself to this project in his 1960 campaign. That commitment is a

matter of public record. The item was deleted by the House committee in its deliberations, and out of respect to this committee, the Florida delegation did not contest that action on the floor. The Senate restored the item and in the conference a deadlocked House conference committee could not agree. Therefore, the item was reported in disagreement. The House conferees are recommending that the item not be placed in the bill. I am urging that the report of the House conferees be rejected and if that is done, I shall offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate version which restores the \$205,000.

Remember, I am speaking for a budget item for advanced engineering and design of the Florida Cross State Canal. We are told that this will complete all preconstruction design. Then we can take another look to decide whether actual construction should begin. But unless we spend this money, we shall have wasted a large part of the money heretofore spent in engineering and design. Starts and stops in any program are costly. We want to finish what we have begun.

This project has been authorized for years. There is no rhyme or reason in suggesting that we go back to the Public Works Committee for another authorization. The engineers have periodically checked this project and they have found that the benefit ratio is steadily improving. Any talk of a new authorization is purely a device to kill the project.

The project now has economic justification of approximately 1.2. It is important not only to Florida, but the U.S. Engineers have stated it will have direct economic benefit to 36 States. It closes a gap between the Atlantic and gulf coastal waterway systems. And let me emphasize here and now, there is no problem in connection with the use by barge traffic of the stretch of open gulf between the western terminus of the canal and the eastern terminus of the Gulf intercoastal canal at St. Marks. This is sheltered water which barges and other craft now traverse everyday without difficulty. The use of the Florida Cross State Barge Canal is not tied to the completion of a canal from St. Marks to the Atlantic.

Now, here is something that deserves your special consideration. Henceforth, most of the missiles to be fired at Cape Canaveral will be so big they must go there by water. Those that go from the gulf coast to Cape Canaveral will save 500 miles if the Cross State Barge Canal is available.

The Caribbean is no longer a placid American lake. The Panama Canal is no longer a certain, safe artery for American and world commerce. Castro and Khrushchev have changed all this.

In World War II the United States lost to enemy submarines, 77 tankers and 88 dry cargo ships operating in the gulf and off the Atlantic coast of Florida. The loss of these 165 ships, their cargoes, many of their crewmembers, resulted in a cost many times as much as the entire Cross State Barge Canal. Anyone who heard the cries of men on those torpedoed and burning ships, or saw the wrecks of men who came ashore, some of them more

dead than alive, will not want that experience repeated.

But Hitler had no base of operations in Cuba or in the Caribbean. He had only a handful of submarines. Khrushchev has a naval base in Cuba. Khrushchev has many times the number of submarines that Hitler had and much better subs. They are missile-carrying subs which endanger the whole eastern seaboard—as well as shipping. The Reds can create havoc along our coasts any day they wish.

So, the canal is a defense measure, too. It will free ships. It will save crews. It will free railroads for coast-to-coast shipping. It will save shipping costs in peace and in war.

For \$205,000—a budget item—we can be ready to go ahead with construction when the time is right. We will have a completed preconstruction package. We will not have spent without avail the \$1½ million which already has gone into this preconstruction package. We will be pennywise and pound foolish to reject this low-cost item at this late and dangerous date in the security of America.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON). Under previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure to me to be the one to speak in reference to the retirement of several members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who are leaving the Congress this year. The Democrats of the committee were good enough to suggest that I bring this matter up because the five members who are retiring are Republicans.

On the other hand, I am sure they will all want to insert their own remarks relative to the loss we shall sustain when these five retire at the end of this session.

These members are: The gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable ROBERT CHIPERFIELD; the gentleman from New Hampshire, the Honorable CHESTER MERROW; the gentlewoman from Illinois, the Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH; the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable LAURENCE CURTIS; and the gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN.

BOB CHIPERFIELD, of the 19th Illinois District, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 83d Congress and since then its ranking Republican, had a long and arduous service on the committee. A brilliant mind, he has contributed much, a very constructive member on the committee trips in which he played a part. Those of us who knew her loved his wife, Kitty, whose long illness finally terminated in her death. Their two children, Robert, now 27, and Virginia, now 21, can be proud of the record their father has made here on Capitol Hill. We shall miss you inordinately, Bob, and we wish for you continued activities in constructive living and unexpected joy.

Next in seniority is CHESTER MERROW of the First District of New Hampshire. A teacher of general science, physics,

chemistry, and biology, later the dean of a Vermont junior college, a Phi Beta Kappa, and a Mason, he has served his people conscientiously and well, lo, these many years. I had the pleasure of going into his district one fall and speaking in his behalf. It was very impressive to see the respect and affection in which he was held by the throng that greeted him. We shall miss you, CHESTER, none more than I. We have sat beside each other for so long.

It is difficult to express my own warm feelings toward MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH of the 13th District of Illinois. Our acquaintance began while we were both just wives of Congressmen, when she filled many responsible positions of influence, not the least of which was the presidency of the Congressional Club. A Wellesley graduate with an A.M. in political science from Columbia University, with honorary degrees from other colleges, she has been a very constructive, earnest member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Her efforts have been directed toward insistence upon more careful checking of every item in foreign aid in all the various ramifications of the committee. We owe her a great deal and frankly, I do not know just where we shall find another who will be as fair, as just, as honest in her criticisms and in her efforts to build more constructive programs. President of the National Alumnae Association of Wellesley College, vice president of the Women's National Republican Club of Chicago, member of the American Association of University Women, a member of the League of Women Voters, one of the Phi Beta Kappa Associates, and a highly respected member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, she represented the United States at the 16th Session of the Assembly of the United Nations. Her two sons and her daughter, Mrs. James O. Wood, Jr., have given her nine grandchildren, to whom she is charmingly devoted. MARGUERITE, we hate to see you go. We are certain that this will be just another step in a life of constructive doing and we shall hope that you will visit us here very often. All power to you.

LAURENCE CURTIS, 10th District of Massachusetts, a strong consecrated American. He served in the U.S. Navy in World War I, where he lost a leg in a training crash in naval aviation and was awarded a Silver Star citation. For 16 years he was elected to the Boston City Council, the State house of representatives of Massachusetts, the State senate, and to the office of State treasurer. Since coming to Washington in 1953 he has been a diligent and faithful servant of the people. His district has lost much and we of the committee are deeply grieved that he was not able to win a very close primary in his State of Massachusetts for the U.S. Senate. LARRY, we wish you so very well. We know what you can do. We know what you have done as a member of the Moose, Elks, Masons, Sons of the Revolution, American Legion, Boston and Massachusetts Bar Association. We fully expect you to go steadily forward in your service to the Nation.

HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, JR., Connecticut's Second District Representative in the House. It has been good to serve with such a man—head of the science department in the Pomfret School in Connecticut, air operations officer in the Pacific in World War II, once a State chairman of the Connecticut Young Republicans, member of Den Grange No. 61, of the American Legion, AMVETS of World War II, a Reserve officer of the United States and active in the Boy Scouts of America.

What a variety of experience your life has brought you. We need men in this country, such as you. We sincerely hope at this writing that you will come back to Capitol Hill in the other body. Heaven bless you.

Mr. Speaker, I have had great joy in serving with these Members of the House of Representatives. They have been fine, honorable members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I shall miss them very, very much. I also know, based upon what the Democratic members have said to me, that they also will miss them.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin, a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time to bring to the attention of our colleagues the forthcoming retirement of five outstanding Members of the Congress of the United States, and in pointing out their contributions to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to our country and to their constituencies.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that we will be saying farewell to these five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Their departure will leave a void which will not be easy to fill for many years.

The Honorable ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, former chairman and currently the ranking minority member of the committee, is retiring after 24 years of service in the Congress. His service in this body has spanned a period of unparalleled crises and change in the world, and witnessed the ascendancy of the United States to the leadership of the free world. He has participated with distinction in the task of shaping our Nation's foreign policy under four administrations. A man of few words, but of great ability and steadfast adherence to principles, he has been a true friend and a respected colleague. I have worked with him in the committee since my first election to the Congress, and I have benefited from our association. I shall miss his wise counsel, his kind and generous disposition.

The sense of loss increases when I think of the other committee members who will be retiring this year:

The Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire, whose efforts to strengthen the mutual security program, and to promote public understanding of

the purposes and objectives of our foreign policy programs, won him national recognition.

The Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois, whose incisive approach to foreign policy issues, unflinching equanimity, moving eloquence and charm brightened the long executive sessions of the committee and contributed so much to a thorough consideration of both sides of each question;

The Honorable LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts, who never wavered in his support of the fundamental purposes of our foreign policy and, in his inimitable fashion, contributed to the resolution of many differences of opinion and conflicts within the committee; and

The Honorable HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, of Connecticut, whose openmindedness, driving force, mature judgment, and pithy comments have helped to clarify many issues and had considerable effect on the committee's decisions.

Each and every one of them has served his or her district, and our Nation, with devotion and distinction. I shall miss them and I am certain, so will the rest of the Committee.

I want to take this opportunity to wish our retiring colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee good health and success in their future endeavors. I hope that they will come back frequently to see us, and to give us the benefit of their counsel.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time for the purpose of paying tribute to the five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who are not candidates for reelection to the House of Representatives, but who are either retiring voluntarily or entering careers in other areas of public service.

It has been my honor and privilege to serve with the Honorable ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, who is retiring after 24 years of service in the Congress. BOB CHIPERFIELD served with distinction as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs during the 83d Congress, and he has been an invaluable member of the committee. He is among the foremost of those who advocate that politics end at the water's edge and that bipartisanship should characterize our approach to the problems of foreign policy. BOB CHIPERFIELD is a man whose ability is equaled only by his personal modesty and his deep sense of responsibility. As chairman of the committee I have come to value his assistance and sage counsel as the ranking minority member, and I know that all members of the committee will share with me the sense of loss that I feel at his departure from the House of Representatives and our committee.

It so happens that each of the members leaving the committee are Republicans, but I regret their loss to the

committee nonetheless. Our committee has for so many years pursued a non-partisan policy in the field of foreign affairs that our differences have been such as to close party lines, and we have worked equally together for the overall good of our country in promoting measures to improve and help our foreign policy objectives.

Another member who has been foremost in these efforts is the Honorable CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire. CHESTER MERROW has untiringly devoted himself to the promotion of major foreign policy legislation and has done much to increase public understanding of U.S. foreign policy objectives, especially in complex areas subject to misinterpretation and the misunderstanding that sometimes plagues our best efforts to secure the backing of a fully informed public opinion.

One of the foremost of the loyal opposition has been the Honorable MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois. Mrs. CHURCH is retiring voluntarily this year after having served on the Committee on Foreign Affairs since January 1953. We shall all miss Mrs. CHURCH's keen analyses of foreign political problems. Mrs. CHURCH has long proved herself one of the most eloquent and articulate Members of the House, and I firmly believe that her constructive criticisms have done much to improve many of the bills which have run the gauntlet of committee hearings and the 5-minute rule.

I shall always cherish fond memories of the Honorable LAURENCE CURTIS of Massachusetts, who brought with him to the committee a deep knowledge of the fundamentals of our Constitution and our public law. He has been an indefatigable member of the committee and with his inherent sense of fair play has contributed greatly to the benefit of the final wording of many major resolutions, and bills, emanating from the committee.

And last, but not least, I must mention the Honorable HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut. His unflinching good humor and his conscientious attention to the details of committee assignments has endeared HORACE SEELEY-BROWN to all of his colleagues of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He has long proved himself an outstanding legislator of great ability, and we shall sorely miss his participation in our future committee meetings.

I shall always cherish the memory of my close association and work with these retiring members of our committee. I consider it a rare personal privilege to have had the honor to serve with members so unselfishly dedicated and conscientious in the discharge of their congressional responsibilities. I know that my feelings are shared by their other colleagues on the committee who, I am certain, join with me in wishing them every success and happiness. I hope also that we will have the pleasure of seeing them from time to time in the future and of benefiting from their counsel and deep knowledge of foreign affairs.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like also to express my appreciation to the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time. I am happy to join in the observance of the departure of these Members. I am not happy to see them leave the committee, because they, each in his own way, have contributed very substantially to the work of the committee at a time when the foreign affairs and foreign policy of this country is of greater importance than at any other time in our history.

Mr. Speaker, we certainly shall miss them and miss their contributions to the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs as well as to the overall program of work of the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to join the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON], in her eulogy and the respect which she is paying to five Members whom she named who are leaving the service here in the Congress of the United States. These Members have performed their service well.

Mr. Speaker, I especially want to say a few words in behalf of the Honorable ROBERT CHIPERFIELD. BOB and I came to Congress together 24 years ago. I have enjoyed my association with Mr. CHIPERFIELD very much. He is the sort of fellow who goes about doing his job in a rather quiet way. But he has served his people well. He is an honorable gentleman, able and respected by each and every one of his colleagues. I am sorry to see BOB leave the Halls of Congress. I wish for him and the others who leave us a most joyful retirement. May God be good to all of them.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY].

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentlewoman from Ohio for taking this time. It is typically thoughtful of her to point up to the Congress and to the Nation that five Republican members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be retiring at the end of this Congress. These Members have a cumulative experience of over 50 years on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Imagine, 50 years of delving into the problems that beset our Government, our Nation, and our free way of life. Think of the vast void that will be caused by their departure. When we consider that Congress goes on from year to year, even though the executive branch of the Government may change every 4 years, the continuity of thought and experience in a committee is vital to the Nation's success, not only in the field of foreign affairs but in all fields.

I think every one of these Members who is retiring has given devoted service. Each has had a special contribution to make. Some have been more effective in the committee than on the floor; some have been effective with junior members of the committee, such as myself, in the

advice and help that they have given, in helping them to become acclimated to the work of this committee and to a realization of the importance of the various matters before us.

I think that the Nation should realize that there is a void that is being created by the departure of five members of this committee at this time. I think also that the Nation should realize, and that we should take the time right now to point up the bipartisan nature of the Foreign Affairs Committee; that the deliberations of these five members do not represent a purely partisan view, that they have more often than not, almost altogether I should say, been concerned with the national effort, with partisanship playing a minimum, in fact almost a negligible, part in the committee. And this is true of the Democratic members of the committee as well, because there we are deliberating on matters concerning not only the future of our own country but the future of the world.

Members who serve on the Committee on Foreign Affairs do so with dedication, even though sometimes their positions are misunderstood, especially when they are not reflective of the popular will of the majority.

Mr. Speaker, this may appear as a lengthy tribute to these five distinguished colleagues of ours, but it does not in any way do justice to their great service not only in the matter of the great length of time they served but in the excellence of their contribution to making this a more peaceful world in which to live.

"Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall see God." Each of the departing Members were peacemakers.

We shall miss them very much, indeed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Speaker, we are very grateful for this moment in which to express our admiration for these retiring Members and our regret that they are leaving us.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to understand how a committee that functions so meticulously in a very sensitive area can lose so many distinguished servants of the people at one time. I feel that this committee is one of the most important in the Congress. It has the responsibility of making determinations as to what nations should be aided and what nations should not. Its members lead and mold the thinking of their constituents, and at first hand see the effects of the appropriations which the legislation from that committee authorizes.

The distinguished gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] has contributed to this House so much in fields of legislative importance. The gentlewoman from Ohio herself has given so much of her time and effort to the work of the committee. I know how she feels at this time at losing so many fine colleagues whose diligent work on the committee has come under her observation. We commend her for bringing to our attention the fact that membership in the

House of Representatives changes rapidly from year to year, and that the servants of the Nation are retiring because under the pressure of circumstances they are not able to carry on further in responding to the multitudinous requests made of them by their constituents and the Nation.

I say again it is wonderful that the gentlewoman has taken the time to bring to our attention the loss of so many fine Members of the House, who have contributed so much to the welfare of this Nation by their service on this important committee, which the Members of the House respect so highly.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the retirement of these five members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to five outstanding members of the Foreign Affairs Committee who are voluntarily terminating their services at the end of this session; namely, ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, CHESTER E. MERROW, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LAURENCE CURTIS, and HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR.

The Foreign Affairs Committee will feel keenly the loss of these true statesmen, loyal representatives, and hard-working legislators. Their dedication to duty as members of this committee will long be remembered as they spared no amount of time and energy to accomplish their goal.

The contributions to the work of the committee have been constructive, and their brilliant approach to the problems of foreign policy and foreign affairs, for which the committee is responsible, reflected thorough research and tremendous effort to master the issue concerned. At all times, during the tenure of these members on the committee, the spirit of bipartisanship prevailed.

The Foreign Affairs Committee and the Nation profited and were favored in having such dedicated members serve on this important committee.

As these loyal servants leave the House of Representatives, I wish them well, and express the hope that our friendship, which has meant a great deal to me, will continue.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the five members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee who are retiring and will not be with us in the 88th Congress starting next January.

To those of us who are relatively new on the committee, these Members, headed by the Honorable ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, ranking minority member and former chairman, have been an inspiration to all of us.

There is little doubt that service on the House Foreign Affairs Committee is the most complicated, the most exhausting and often the most exasperating of any committee in Congress.

Problems are not only national, they are global in scope. Finding rules and guidelines which apply to all nations in the free world at times seems like an impossible task.

Yet these Members have taken a leading part in steering a course through the confusion and in creating effective, bipartisan legislation which has served the principles of our Nation efficiently and adequately over the years.

The members of the committee who are leaving us have a sound record of accomplishment which spans a number of years and a number of administrations.

In addition to Representative CHIPERFIELD, they are CHESTER E. MERROW, of New Hampshire; Mrs. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, of Illinois; LAURENCE CURTIS, of Massachusetts; and HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., of Connecticut.

Not only was it an honor working so closely on problems of such great importance to the world, but it was a pleasure in every respect.

I am sure all of my colleagues join me in wishing them every success in the years ahead. They have been distinguished members of this committee, most able Members of Congress, and good friends to all of us.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I join with the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] in expression of the break that is in all our hearts as we contemplate the vacant seats when the Committee on Foreign Affairs meets again in January. These seats will be occupied, of course, by replacements, new members of our committee who I am sure in time as we work with them will become entrenched in our esteem and affection; but they will be vacant of the members long associated with us and with whom long years of association have woven ties, the breaking of which we cannot contemplate without tears in our eyes.

Ours is a closely knit family, perhaps more so than any committee in the House. Five members of our committee are not candidates for reelection. They are all Republicans, but on our committee there is no cold division along party lines. We have differences, of course, but every member of the committee accepts and follows the rule that politics ends at the ocean line. It would be an evil day for our country if ever it were otherwise.

Two of the departing Members, both retiring voluntarily, are from Illinois, my dear friends for many years. The late Honorable Ralph Church, husband of the gentlewoman from Illinois, Congresswoman MARGUERITE CHURCH, from early manhood was one of my warm and close friends. I have never ceased to mourn his passing. I have felt very close in friendship to MARGUERITE CHURCH. We have had so much in common interest and in the broad outlines the philosophy that guides our thinking and our actions is the same. MARGUERITE CHURCH is one

of the ablest women in America. I rate her in the top flight of effective women public speakers, that I have known in a period of half a century. She is a dedicated servator of mankind. I will miss more than I can contemplate with equanimity our association in the work of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. My only consolation is that in the years ahead she will be enjoying, not the relaxation of vacation, but the great experience of devoting her hours to expanding her knowledgeable understanding in new and worthy fields, freed from the congressional pressures.

I will miss the gentleman from Illinois [BOB CHIPERFIELD] as keenly as it is possible for one to feel a separation. I knew his father, Burnett Mitchell Chiperfield, a Member of the Congress in 1915, when I was lieutenant governor of Illinois, and again in 1929 and 1933, one of the outstanding sons of Illinois, in war and in peace. Indeed, of all the illustrious sons of Illinois none have been higher in the esteem of our people than the Chiperfields, father and son. BOB came to the Congress in 1939, 6 years after the retirement of his distinguished father and 1 year after his father's death. He was a great chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. During my service on that committee he was the ranking minority member.

I can never adequately convey to him my deep appreciation of his many kindnesses to me and his helpfulness to me on the committee of which he had been chairman and was then the ranking minority member. BOB CHIPERFIELD is a great American in every sense of the word. He is an American patriot in the fullest sense, a worthy son of a father who raised a regiment to serve in the Spanish American War and in World War I served in France with the famous 33d Division and was retired as a brigadier general.

I never knew BOB CHIPERFIELD to be guilty of a petty act. I never knew him to speak a word unless it were in kindness.

Mr. Speaker, this country of ours can ill afford to lose the service of CHESTER MERROW, and if it were in the power of my selection, he, although a Republican, would be drafted for a high position in the Foreign Service. I have never known a more dedicated person. I do not think that anyone has made a larger contribution to the education of the American people to the purpose of our foreign aid. Under Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy his always has been the bipartisan approach, and while loyal to his party, his first thought has always been of what is good for the country. He leaves our committee with the admiration and the affection of every member on the Democratic side and I am sure that this also is the sentiment among all his colleagues on the Republican side.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that I was thrilled when I listened to the early returns from Massachusetts in the recent primary and our colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts, LAURENCE CURTIS, was leading with the prospect of pulling an upset. Of course, as a Demo-

crat and from another State, there was no legitimacy in my interest. Moreover, I did not know the young man with whom LAURENCE CURTIS was in contest. But, Mr. Speaker, friendship gives a legitimacy in interest that transcends geography and political affiliation.

I have been enriched by my association with LAURENCE CURTIS. I was not a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs when first I met him, as occasionally we would dine at the Congressional Hotel. I did not know that the absent leg had been given in the service of his country. I did not know of his wealth and of his proud ancestry. There was nothing pompous, nothing self-aggrandizing. I got the picture of a humble man of human kindness. That impression was deepened when we became associated together on the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I learned then of his great ability and I had no prouder moments than when on a few occasions, when on some question we were very much in the minority, his vote and mine were the same. In my book LAURENCE CURTIS is a true representative of the finest traits of character. My only hope is that after his recent experience in a Republican primary in Massachusetts, he will see the light and come into the Democratic fold. This, of course, I know he will not do because no one on earth could shake him in his convictions. I shall miss him very, very much when our committee meets again in January.

The gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable HORACE SEELY-BROWN, JR., came to the Congress in 1947, a Member of the 80th Congress that was praised by the Republicans and used as a whipping boy by the Democrats. He had the misfortune to come from one of those swing districts that puts you in, then yanks you out, then puts you in again. He was not a Member of the 81st Congress, but he did return to the 82d Congress and that was the beginning of our association. He came to our Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 87th Congress as a successor of the Honorable Chester Bowles. No member of that committee ever came with a greater challenge. Chester Bowles had been one of our outstanding ambassadors. He had been Governor of his State. He had been one of the outstanding members of the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. To the Committee on Foreign Affairs he brought a tremendous wealth of experience and of knowledge. It was not an easy matter to follow in the footsteps of Chester Bowles. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that anyone on the Democratic side of our committee had anything but the kindest sentiment toward HORACE SEELY-BROWN. He quickly became a member of our closely knit family, and I can assure him that we will miss him very very much. I cannot, of course, extend to him my good wishes in the elections in November. But I can say to him that all of us were happy at the great honor bestowed upon him by his party, the honor of designation as its senatorial nominee. While I do not anticipate his election, nor would I wish to be placed in

the position of advocating it, I am nevertheless convinced that the Republicans of his State picked the best of the crop. He will leave the committee with the affectionate wishes of his colleagues for his future success and happiness, with only this difference, that his Republican colleagues will wish that success and happiness come in public life while his Democratic colleagues wish it to be in private life.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, should like to compliment the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] for taking this time to mark the departure from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of five of its members.

Each of these members has been a substantial member of this committee at a time when the foreign policy of the United States has more significance than ever before in our history and through that membership has contributed to making that policy strong.

We shall miss the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD] for the pertinent contribution which he has been able to make because of his unique experience and his long knowledge of the foreign affairs problems of the United States.

We shall miss the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MERROW] because of his sympathetic and kindly approach to all the problems of our committee and, in particular, for the great contribution which he made following the war, to the cause of creating an international organization to preserve the peace of the world.

We shall miss the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. CHURCH] because of her analytical mind and the skill with which she was able to describe a problem and articulate a response to any problem that arose.

We shall miss the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURTIS] because of the craftsmanship with which his legal training and judicial approach enabled him to plumb to the depths of problems of legal draftsmanship and legislative policy.

Finally, we shall miss the presence of my colleague, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], who was a faithful member of our committee and who, through his long congressional experience, was enabled to bring to our task of legislating, a practical approach which added greatly to the finished work.

Each of these members, in his own way, has lived up to the American ideal of service and has helped by his skilled labors to make our democratic system function more effectively.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, MARGUERITE CHURCH and I came to Congress at the same time and my admiration for her as a legislator and a lady has continued unabated throughout her service in the House. Her contributions to good government include not only diligence in her work but a polished performance as an orator. In the critical field of foreign affairs she has displayed a fearless and highly intelligent approach to the bewildering problems of our Nation's position in international relations. In addition, her constant and serious attention

to all matters of legislation has been outstanding and should stand out as a shining example to all of us. Her code of duty as a Member of the House included faithful attendance at its sessions.

Mrs. CHURCH leaves Congress with a record of many accomplishments and contributions to the cause of clean and decent government. I personally regret that she has seen fit not to be a candidate for reelection and I wish to extend my best wishes for her future health and happiness.

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EDMONDSON).—Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, as this session draws to a close, we face the loss of our esteemed colleague, GORDON H. SCHERER, who will retire after 10 years of ably and tirelessly representing the First Congressional District of Ohio.

I know he will be missed by us all, but I particularly will feel his absence. He has been of invaluable help to me, a freshman Member of this body, as well as a loyal friend. I have thanked him personally and now wish to take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation to him.

A lawyer by profession, Mr. SCHERER began his public service on the staff of the prosecuting attorney's office in his native Cincinnati. He then served as Cincinnati's director of safety, as a member of the Cincinnati City Council for two terms, and as a member of the Cincinnati Planning Commission. His numerous significant accomplishments in these posts were recognized and applauded.

In November of 1952, by nearly a 2-to-1 majority, the people of his district wisely elected Mr. SCHERER to the 83d Congress and since then to each succeeding Congress. His record during these past 10 years as Representative of the First District of Ohio speaks for itself. It is well known that he is a diligent and energetic legislator who has executed his responsibilities in a conscientious and dedicated manner. He has rendered memorable service not only to the fine people of his district, but to the entire Nation as well.

I would like especially to pay tribute to GORDON SCHERER's eminently creditable service as ranking minority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. In the face of widespread abuse heaped upon members of that committee by Communists and Communist sympathizers his convictions remained unshaken. In the face of proposals to abolish the committee, he courageously defended its uncompromising and relentless efforts to uncover subversion in our Government and to recommend remedial legislation.

As the ranking minority member of the Roads Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works, GORDON SCHERER worked long and hard on legislative proposals which led to the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956. The largest peacetime public works program in our his-

tory, it is providing this Nation with an interstate network of highways on a pay-as-you-go basis. When it became apparent that the Federal cost of completing the interstate system would exceed original estimates, Mr. SCHERER promptly introduced legislation to raise the money to pay for these highways as they were being built so the obligation would not be passed on to future generations.

I commend GORDON SCHERER's intellectual honesty and his courage, his high principles and his refusal to compromise those principles. He has consistently voted and voiced his convictions.

His career to date has been a distinguished one but, I feel sure, is but a prologue to continued achievements and dedicated service. I know my colleagues join me in wishing him success in whatever new ventures he may undertake and many years of happiness.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [GORDON SCHERER]. I had the great pleasure and privilege of serving on the Public Works Committee with him and I know that he has rendered an outstanding service to the Nation. He has been one of the most effective members of this committee where his enormous experience and ability has earned him the respect and admiration of his colleagues from both sides of the aisle. The enlightened and aggressive manner in which he helped to accelerate our highway program will, in my judgment, make this country preeminent in metropolitan, regional, and transcontinental travel.

GORDON SCHERER has also been a hard-hitting member of the Un-American Activities Committee. His efforts to keep the Congress and the American people properly informed of the shifting Communist Party strategy and tactics so that they may better cope with the Communist challenge both here and abroad, has been outstanding. He deserves the gratitude of every American citizen for what he has accomplished on this important committee.

As a freshman Member of Congress, I have thoroughly enjoyed my personal friendship and association with GORDON SCHERER and I shall always remember his kindness and willingness to be helpful at all times. I wish to extend to him my profound wishes for his continued good health, vigor, and happiness.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to join my colleague in this much deserved tribute to a great American, GORDON SCHERER. I will always remember that I served with Gordon and if I am fortunate enough to continue as a Member of this House I will be a better Member because of the philosophy and the advice of this great American.

Possibly I take a particularly great measure of pride in the fact that Gordon and I are usually found on the same side of the tally after the roll is called. If we do vote differently—and that is rare—it is a good signal to me to reconsider my position.

His work on the Committee on Un-American Activities has gone without the great tribute he deserves. Few

Americans, I am sure, fully appreciate the value of his service here. Certainly the Communists will be among the only ones in this country who will look with favor upon his retirement.

I trust that he will have many years of public service ahead though he won't be in this House. His sense of civic duty, I know, will demand his continued interest and participation in the affairs of our country and I wish the very best to him as he goes back to Cincinnati.

Mr. MOSHER. Mr. Speaker, I regret that only for one term have I had the good fortune to serve in this body with the very distinguished Member from Ohio's First District, GORDON SCHERER.

I look forward to the opportunities future years will afford to continue and cultivate my friendship with GORDON, as he begins his very important new service in the great Cincinnati community as leader of our Republican Party there, and as an active leader in many other important aspects of that area's progress.

But, selfishly, I wish that I could have continued the day-to-day association with the gentleman from Cincinnati here in the House. We have need of his ability and experience, as well as the friendly assistance he has given to so many of us in our personal relationships with him. He will be sorely missed. He leaves a void in this body which I doubt can be adequately filled for a long time to come.

Congressman SCHERER, as you well know, Mr. Speaker, and as is known to all of us in the House, is one of the most sincerely dedicated, most conscientiously hard-working, studious Members. Those traits have made him the acknowledged expert and respected authority on every subject on which he has concentrated in his extraordinary devotion to his important committee assignments.

But I will miss him most, personally, as one of those experienced and dependable Members who have been so willing and so generous in their sound advice and the sharing of their wisdom and knowledge, as we first-termers have called upon them for assistance.

One of the happiest aspects of my experiences as a first-termers has been the valuable help, on a completely genial and generous basis, which has been made available to the new here, by the more senior Members on both sides of the aisle. And high on the list of those who have been most helpful, certainly, is our friend, GORDON SCHERER.

All of us, new and older Members alike, will miss him greatly. But all of us certainly wish him complete success and happiness as he moves on to perform the further great public service which, with characteristic devotion, he feels is his proper calling.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the 87th Congress we, in Ohio and the citizens of this Nation, are losing one of the most able and effective Congressmen in the history of this Nation.

The Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of the First Congressional District of Ohio, is retiring from service to his country. His record has been indelibly written in the proceedings of the House of Repre-

sentatives and it will be certainly difficult to fill his shoes.

In my short tenure here, it has been my privilege to serve with Mr. SCHERER on the Committee on Public Works. In this field, Congressman SCHERER has made a most outstanding record. He is known throughout the Nation as one of the foremost authorities on Federal highways program. He has been one of the most effective advocates of this, the largest peacetime Federal highways program in our history and Mr. SCHERER has had the courage to insist that this tremendous effort be placed on a "pay-as-you-go" basis.

GORDON has served with the same distinction on other subcommittees of the great Committee on Public Works and it has been through this service that I had the great fortune to come in contact with him.

As a freshman member of that committee, GORDON has been of invaluable service and help to me and for this assistance and service I wish to personally thank him and take this opportunity to publicly express my appreciation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that while Mr. SCHERER has been a diligent and effective legislator in matters dealing with public works, I feel that his greatest service to this Nation has been the outstanding effort he has made as a ranking minority member of the House Un-American Activities Committee.

In the face of widespread abuse, threat and intimidation by Communists and their fellow travelers, his convictions have remained unshaken. He has courageously and uncompromisingly fought to protect the American way of life. He truly has rendered a great service to this country.

It is with the deepest regret that I watch GORDON SCHERER retire from this active, dedicated service to his fellow Americans. His devotion to duty and his responsibility to his constituents and to the overall welfare of this Nation, have been foremost in his thoughts as he has labored in these hallowed halls.

I cannot but deeply regret GORDON's decision to retire, but that is a personal matter which we all at times are confronted with. My only hope is that he will continue to have success in whatever new venture he undertakes and that he will have many years of happiness.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was with profound regret that I learned of our colleague, GORDON SCHERER's decision to retire from membership in the House of Representatives.

His long service, spanning five Congresses, has earned him the respect of every Member of this body. His keen and tenacious participation in the crucial work of the Public Works Committee, and especially of the House Un-American Activities Committee, has been of incalculable value to the security of the Nation. Through his work on the Public Works Committee he has contributed much to the highway program of America.

Our long personal association has been of the greatest value to me. His advice has been sound, his understanding profound and we shall all miss the presence of his wisdom and integrity.

May I wish him every success and satisfaction upon his return to his home and his law practice. I know that the Cincinnati Republican organization will be in good hands with GORDON SCHERER as its leader, and that his great contributions to public service and civic welfare will continue to benefit his city, his State and the Nation.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks made by the gentlemen from Ohio about our colleague, Hon. GORDON H. SCHERER, of the First District, who is voluntarily retiring at the end of this Congress. GORDON was first elected to the 83d Congress—taking his seat in January 1953. He has been a hard worker and one of the most conscientious Members of this body. We all know about his effective work as a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities and the Public Works Committee. When GORDON speaks on any of the subjects under the jurisdiction of these committees, we know that his words are authoritative.

We are going to miss you very much GORDON, but we wish for you and yours all the best things of life. Good luck to you in all your endeavors.

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the voluntary retirement from Congress of GORDON SCHERER is a genuine loss to the Nation and the State of Ohio. Capable, industrious, and highly intelligent, he has dignified the office of Congressman during his five terms as Representative from Ohio's First District. His service on the Public Works Committee of the House was so outstanding in the field of Federal highway program that he has been recognized as a national authority on the subject. On the Un-American Activities Committee his fearless and unrelenting efforts to ferret out Reds in government and expose the Communist apparatus have marked him as a true patriot. My personal affection for him and respect for his performance as a Member of the House is exceeded only by my sincere regret in seeing him depart from Congress. A man of his stature will always contribute much to the Nation and his community regardless of his position and I join with my colleagues and his many friends here in Washington in extending my best wishes for his future endeavors.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to an outstanding Ohioan and a great American who retires from the Congress at the close of this session. I have reference to our good friend, the Honorable GORDON H. SCHERER, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

GORDON SCHERER's retirement from Congress will leave a terrific void in these Halls as he has been a most effective Member of the House-Un-American Activities Committee to say nothing of his effective work on the House Public Works Committee. Any member of the House Un-American Activities Committee is subjected to ridicule and abuse by the Communists, fellow travelers, and left wingers but because of GORDON SCHERER's dedication, unusual abilities, and effectiveness, he has been subjected to more than his share. During these

trying times, however, he has been able to take solace from the fact that freedom-loving, patriotic Americans everywhere were in his corner. In addition, GORDON SCHERER believed in what he was doing with all his strength and with all his heart.

Knowing GORDON SCHERER as I do, I know that his retirement from Congress will not be the end of his work to keep America free from Communist domination.

It is an honor for me to wish this truly great American good health, happiness and success in the years that lie ahead.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, GORDON SCHERER has been my friend for a lifetime, and I have the greatest admiration for him. He will be sorely missed in the Ohio Republican delegation and by his other colleagues in the House of Representatives on both sides of the aisle. He has rendered exceptionally good service in the Congress and in local office, as well. He has carried the flag for Americanism high as a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee, and he has made an outstanding contribution to the welfare of this Republic through exposure of its enemies engaged in subversion and other activities.

Not only the people of his hometown and his home State of Ohio, but the people of the Nation as a whole, owe GORDON SCHERER a great debt of gratitude for the wonderful service he has given.

Our respect, affection, and love go with him as he returns to private life.

Mr. SCHENCK. Mr. Speaker, it is always difficult to say "so long" to a colleague and friend with whom one has worked for a number of years. It is especially difficult for me to do so in the case of GORDON SCHERER because he has done such an outstandingly good job here in the Congress of the United States.

GORDON SCHERER was eminently well qualified to meet and perform his duties and responsibilities as a Member of the Congress. He is not only recognized and highly respected as a very able attorney, and a man who performed his duties in a very distinguished manner as an assistant prosecuting attorney for Hamilton County, Ohio; the director of safety for the city of Cincinnati, and a member of the city of Cincinnati City Council, along with many other civic and fraternal activities, but he has also served with great distinction for 8 years here in the Congress.

GORDON SCHERER is thorough and sincere in meeting every responsibility and in everything he does. He, as a member of the House Committee on Public Works and as the ranking Republican member of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, has had a leading and important part in developing the greatest roadbuilding program in the history of our Nation.

As a member and later as the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities he has always been an unrelenting foe of anyone who sought to interfere with, tear down, or to destroy in any way the sound principles upon which our Nation has been founded and has become the greatest

Nation in the world. GORDON SCHERER has been completely fair to anyone and everyone who has been called to testify before the Committee on Un-American Activities but he has also been completely courageous and unyielding against any person or organization he is convinced is trying to compromise or destroy our American way of life.

We, of the Ohio Republican delegation in the House of Representatives, try to hold luncheons at regular intervals during the months when the House is in session if we can do so without interfering with our responsibilities on the floor of the House. We are most fortunate in having each member of our delegation as a member of important legislative and appropriation committees. These luncheons give us an opportunity to obtain firsthand information on and to discuss measures which are being considered in our respective committees. We find that by so doing we are better informed and hence better able to serve the district we each represent and the entire Nation. GORDON SCHERER, not only because of his devoted service on his committees but also because of his personal knowledge gained through his on-the-spot hearings on the road construction programs and the matters before his Committee on Un-American Activities, has been able to give his Ohio colleagues the benefit of his knowledge and experience. This has enabled each of us to better serve our district and the Nation.

It has been a privilege, inspiration, and pleasure to serve and work here in the Congress with our colleague, GORDON SCHERER. We shall miss him and the Nation shall miss him. Personally, I sincerely regret that he is leaving the Congress. I can only say a very sincere "thank you" to him and to express my wishes that he will have many more years of good health, happiness, and success.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, as the 87th Congress reaches toward adjournment, I think it is altogether fitting that we pay tribute to a distinguished legislator who has compiled an outstanding record of public service. GORDON H. SCHERER, of Cincinnati, Ohio, has served the people of his district and the Nation in a truly distinguished manner and it has been a great pleasure to serve with him in the House of Representatives.

When I came to Congress in January of 1961, GORDON SCHERER was among the first to offer me advice and a helping hand. His years of experience were shared with me and I shall always be grateful for the assistance he gave me as a freshman Member of this Chamber.

We will all miss his advice and counsel just as we treasure his friendship. I would very much like to join my colleagues in wishing him every possible future happiness and assure him that he has every right to be proud of the fine record he has established here in the House of Representatives.

WHITE HOUSE REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentle-

man from Michigan [Mr. MEADER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MEADER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, I reported to the House on the progress or lack of progress, in the General Accounting Office investigation of the cost and legality of the White House Regional Conferences held in November of 1961. My remarks are found on pages 22677 through 22680 of the RECORD of October 5, 1962.

I have been advised today that one of the five agencies which had failed to report as of last week, the Department of Commerce, had now reported that 93 employees had participated and that a total of 2,876 man hours had been consumed at an estimated cost of \$30,276.13.

I have also been advised by the General Accounting Office that they had determined that the Government Printing Office had printed 24,910 copies of the 84 page magazine-size brochure entitled "Report to the President—White House Regional Conferences—November 1961," at a cost of \$9,602.19, and that this cost was charged to the Special Projects Account of the White House office. Thus, if we add these two additional items to the \$111,300 previously reported, we find that the cost of the White House Regional Conferences estimated to date total \$151,178.32.

There still remain three departments and one agency to report. The Departments of Agriculture, Interior and Labor, and the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It is fair to say that these four agencies might well provide a very sizable addition to the estimated cost of the White House Regional Conferences' propaganda effort. It should be noted that one of the principle topics plugged by the New Frontier propagandists was under the heading of "Opportunities for Our Cities." Another was "Conservation and Recreational Development," and still another was "Farm and Rural Progress," and another, "Full Employment and Economic Growth." Some of the stars of this Madison Avenue-type road show whose campaign-type photographs are sprinkled through the 84-page booklet, were the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Robert Weaver, Secretary of Labor Goldberg, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman, and Secretary of Interior Udall. It appears to me that these agencies may have engaged in this program so extensively, and the cost to the taxpayer have been so high, that they would like to delay their reports until after the November 6 election.

I am also disappointed that the General Accounting Office has not yet reached a final opinion on the legality of these expenditures. Certainly I am aware that the General Accounting Office has had plenty of trouble in extracting from these departments the figures on personnel, man-hours, and estimated costs, and it is perfectly understandable why the New Frontier bureaucrats are reluctant to divulge these figures. Yet I cannot completely absolve the General Accounting Office from failure to have arrived at some decision concerning the legality of these expenditures, since their attention has been called to this matter for almost 1 year,

and whether they were legal or illegal does not require waiting until all of the figures were in.

Whatever research on the legality of these expenditures needed to have been done, should have been commenced so that a conclusion could have been reached when the report of estimated costs of some \$111,000 was furnished to the members of the House Government Operations Committee on September 12.

HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, as we approach what I hope may be the closing hours of the session we are reminded of Members of this House who will not be back here to serve when the House convenes again next January.

I want to take a brief moment at this point to remind the House of the very distinguished service of my colleague from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]. Such a dissertation might well be entitled "A Quarter of a Century of Service," for CARL came to this House 24 years ago and since that time has served in a most admirable, a most dedicated, and a most distinguished manner.

Were I now to take the time to reiterate to the Members of the House the great volume of service, the monuments, if you will, that he leaves not only to his district, to his State, and to his Nation, I know that I would further prolong the adjournment of the House. So I hope that it may suffice that I should refer to just a very few of them.

It is no secret, I know, to anyone here that during the course of these many years of service CARL has been a champion of every cause which he in his judgment felt would best serve the interests of his district, his State, and his Nation.

I should be remiss were I not to mention as a most distinguished area, the field of agriculture, and the degree to which he has directed his attention and his effective endeavors in this cause. I do not suppose there is a single facet of the entire agricultural scene that exists throughout the Nation to which he has not directed his attention and been alert at all times in his concern to improve the economic opportunities of farm people. This has been evidenced in the field of conservation, in price supports, in problems having to do with water use and conservation, and in problems of surplus or whatever the problems have been over the course of these many years. While I have made reference only to this particular part of his service, I think it follows that he has directed the very same dedication and the very same interest and the very same sound judgment to every problem that has come before this Congress.

I suppose that possibly from my standpoint, I being in comparison to CARL's service at this point but a freshman in this body, that I have had a closer degree of association with him, during the time that I have been here at least, than have a good many others because I have lived right across the street

from him. Consequently, we have had occasion to be exposed to him and his very charming wife, Martha, on many social occasions as well as in the performance of duties that we have shared in common as Members of this body. This has served to further alert me to the degree of dedication that he displays. But possibly even more important, and I recall this so well when I came here as a freshman: As all of you know, there are some problems involved in becoming initiated to all of the intricate functions of this body, and I shall always cherish the counsel and the advice that CARL so willingly provided to me as I know he did to so many other Members. Always I found it to be most reliable, most dependable, and the kind of advice that served me in good stead in many, many instances.

I think it should be noted at this point that in spite of his many duties here and the number of hours that he devoted to such duties, he still at the same time found sufficient time to care for and to devote his energetic efforts in behalf of his church. Because it so happens that he and I attended the same church, consequently, I had occasion to witness the degree of his contribution in that field as well.

Mr. Speaker, even with this brief reference to these many most distinguished areas of service, I still have barely scratched the surface so far as Mr. ANDERSEN's contributions to our society are concerned. I should want to add just one more point because I think this becomes really pertinent in analyzing the character and the degree of his dedication. It is no secret that he was called upon to participate in a very delicate election contest, a contest that became difficult because of a redistricting problem that we had in Minnesota. The results, of course, were such that they made the speech I am making here now necessary. The really remarkable and the notable part of it is the very wonderful attitude he has displayed since that election. I had occasion to call him immediately upon his return to Washington after that occasion and found him at that point to display again the same kind of calm judgment, the same kind of concern for society, and registered his observation that this was one of the hazards that all of us are subject to when we perform in a political arena. I suppose you could not give greater credit to any man than when one in adversity is able to recognize and talk with that kind of grace of the experience that he had just gone through at that particular point.

So it is almost trite for me to say at this point that we recognize the great loss to this legislative body, for it is so true. By the same token, I think we are recognizing the wealth of benefits all of us as Members of this body as well as the citizens throughout the United States and throughout the world are going to continue to enjoy and to cherish for years and years to come.

There is no combination of words or phrases that I know of or that is within my limited ability to reach that could properly recognize in the manner that they should be, the benefits that have

accrued to all of us by virtue of his dedication to the field of public service. Probably the closest we could come to that at this point would be for each of us to rededicate our efforts in the sense that we would try to achieve the same magnitude of accomplishment it has been the good fortune of H. CARL ANDERSEN to have achieved.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I am proud to yield to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. I should like to join in tribute to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and subscribe to all the gentleman has said.

It has been my great honor and privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee for the last 10 years with the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN. I know of his dedication to the work; I know of the many hard and grueling hours he has put in on that committee. I think the entire Nation owes a debt to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, for his foresight in the subcommittee work that he did and particularly I have the firm conviction that the Nation owes him a great debt of gratitude for the work that he has done. I think he has been a great champion of the farm population of this Nation. But in addition to that, it seems to me that the taxpayers should also pay a tribute to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, because in his service on that committee I know of the millions of dollars he has saved from waste in his diligent work.

I compliment the gentleman for bringing this matter to the floor; and to the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN, I say: "Godspeed and happy, happy days ahead when you are no longer in this grueling job in the House of Representatives."

The gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, is a fine friend, a distinguished gentleman, and a great patriot.

Mr. LANGEN. We of Minnesota are very proud of the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, and we are grateful for the gentleman's most appropriate comments.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, I came to Congress the same year that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, came here. We have been closely associated for the past 24 years. We have been on the Committee on Appropriations together for the past 20 years. CARL and I have sat together and have worked together on that committee, he being just next to me on that very important committee for the past 20 years.

I know the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN. I know the wonderful work that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, has done on the many wonderful things which he has accomplished for the farmers of this great blessed land of ours. He was co-author of the Watershed Act, which will prove to be one of the greatest things to

conserve our priceless topsoil that has ever been accomplished in this country of ours for the future of America.

I have traveled with CARL to foreign lands to look into matters of great importance to this country and to try to find out what these many foreign lands were doing with our taxpayers' dollars. We brought back a report which has saved this Nation many, many millions of dollars, because it was used by the Committee on Appropriations in its deliberations to determine what the different nations should have under the Foreign Aid Act.

I am going to miss CARL, possibly more than most any other Member of this House, because of our close association and my great regard for his integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I can only hope and pray that CARL will have many, many years in which to enjoy his retirement from this body. He deserves much. I know that the Supreme Ruler of the Universe will see to it that the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, his good wife and family, will enjoy many, many years of happy life together.

Mr. Speaker, we hope that CARL will be close here. I want to counsel with CARL about the farm problem and about a lot of problems, as I have always done, on which occasions I have found his counsel always good.

Mr. Speaker, CARL and I introduced a farm bill a number of years ago. It was called the green pastures bill. I say advisedly that had that bill been made law the farm problem would be nonexistent today. I believe that just as surely as I stand here. So, we hope that CARL will come back and visit the House often and that we may profit by his counsel and by his fine friendship.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the American people are greatly indebted to my friend, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN. It has been my privilege to serve on the Appropriations Committee with CARL for about 19 years and on the Subcommittee for Agriculture for about 17 years. During several of those years he was chairman.

During all that period he has been my friend but even more a tireless worker for American agriculture. I know of no man who has done more for those who work than has the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

Thereby he has made the greatest contribution to the American people, for food, clothing, and shelter remain basic. Our agriculture does such a fine job that it frees 90 percent of the American people to do other things.

It was my privilege to serve under CARL's chairmanship when with his leadership the watershed protection and flood prevention pilot plant program was initiated, without budget approval. Truly

ly this program and the resulting benefits is monument enough for any man. The gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, has many other outstanding and consistent services to which he can point with pride. The American people today and tomorrow will be indebted to the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

As one who works with appropriations, defense, public works, agriculture, and all the rest, I shall personally miss the fine work done by my friend and colleague.

To him and his fine family I wish the very best and many fruitful years which he has so richly earned.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have served with my friend the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, for 8 years. I have seen him tested time after time.

All down through the years he has been a true friend of the American farmer. He has supported all programs which have benefited the family farmer. No Member of the House has been a stronger advocate of REA and soil conservation than the gentleman from Minnesota, CARL ANDERSEN. He believes that agriculture must prosper if our Nation is to prosper.

I want to wish for him a long, happy life and best of everything in his retirement as a Member of Congress.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my colleagues in paying sincere tribute to our fellow Member, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable H. CARL ANDERSEN.

Like myself CARL is a native of the State of Washington and so we in the Evergreen State have a special interest as well as Minnesota.

I have served with CARL on the Appropriations Committee since 1945 and have served with him continuously on the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for most of those 18 years. The Honorable JAMIE WHITTEN, CARL and I have worked together for a long while on that same subcommittee.

You get to know your fellow man pretty well in such close relationship. You get to know what makes a man click; what his uprisings and his down-sittings are.

H. CARL ANDERSEN's great love is agriculture and the welfare of the farmers of this great Nation.

He worked hard at his Appropriations Committee work. He labored hard and long as chairman of the Subcommittee

on Agriculture Appropriations in the 83d Congress and is one of the authors of the watershed program of 1954. He should be particularly proud of this for the work of this action has been of great benefit.

Along with my fellows I wish CARL, his lovely wife and fine family every positive good for many, many years to come.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe wholeheartedly and fully to the tribute which has been paid here today to our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, by the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGEN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the gentleman's remarks about our colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN. Although I did not know the gentleman from Minnesota as intimately as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN], in my 10 years here in the House I was always impressed by the fervor with which H. CARL ANDERSEN defended the rights of the farmers of his district. Although at times we did not agree on that farm policy, he was a very eloquent advocate and a very successful one.

Mr. Speaker, to him I wish a very healthy, happy retirement, and many years of ease in the future.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have served in the Congress of the United States with the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN, have known him as a man with an established reputation, integrity, effectiveness. H. CARL's dedication to his convictions has been such that he has even come from a hospital bed to return to the floor of the House of Representatives to cast his vote. Little wonder, then, that the people of his district in Minnesota sent H. CARL to Washington 12 times to represent them in Congress. In his 24 years of service to Minnesotans, he has been a leader in appropriations for agriculture and has been one of the mainstays on that committee. It is generally acknowledged that without his assistance on the Appropriations Committee the St. Paul and South St. Paul flood control project may not have gone forward as it has. For this and many other services he has rendered, he will not be forgotten by his colleagues. I want to express a personal word of gratitude for the many times H. CARL has helped me as I was learning the congressional procedures in years past, and for the encouragement and consideration he has always shown me as we worked together in more recent years. He will always be remembered most kindly for those things and my every good wish goes with him and Mrs. Andersen as they leave the Congress at the end of 24 years of service.

Mr. LANGEN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York, for those most appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, if I may say in conclusion, it is my desire, and I am sure the desire of a good many others, that Mr. and Mrs. Andersen be afforded a very generous portion of comfort and satisfaction in the years ahead.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the retirement of the gentleman from Minnesota, H. CARL ANDERSEN.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the critical plight of the Yugoslav refugee.

The report of the House Appropriations Committee on the foreign aid bill creates the distinct impression that the framers of the report are uncertain as to the legitimacy of U.S. assistance to Yugoslav refugees.

I want to express the hope that the Department of State will not interpret congressional ambiguity as authorizing any discrimination against the Yugoslav refugees, for they are among our strongest allies in the continuing struggle against Communist totalitarianism.

I would at this time like to insert in the RECORD an excellent statement on this subject prepared by the National Catholic Welfare Conference and the International Rescue Committee. I hope that it will receive the widest possible attention:

THE PLIGHT OF REFUGEES FLEEING FROM YUGOSLAVIA

Prior to the erection of the Berlin wall, East Germany was not the only refugee-producing Communist country in Europe. Mass flights occurred from other areas, such as Hungary in 1956, and year after year about 10,000 Yugoslav refugees have fled that country. Yet how many Americans know that a large segment of the Yugoslavs have not been able to obtain asylum in the West and that many have been forcibly returned to Yugoslavia?

It almost appears that it required a wall and the merciless terror of the Communist police at the wall to create concern for today's refugees and to have them accepted for what they are: victims of totalitarian oppression who flee from pervasive political, spiritual, and economic devastations which they correctly identify with the Communist system.

It is the same type of refugee who is seeking freedom, whether he comes from East

Germany, Hungary, or Yugoslavia. Most are young, some are very young. Although they may not be able to articulate the reason which makes them come, it is invariably a desire to escape the police state, its totalitarian control as well as its economic deprivation. A man's yearning for freedom and human dignity is quite compatible with his hope of economic betterment.

Mass flights are always an expression of disaffection and opposition, the final protest where other protests are made impossible by political terror. Where people have no other vote, they are forced to vote with their feet. Our answer to the refugee problem is an index of the political imagination and the moral temper of the West.

The ambivalent attitude of the West toward Communist Yugoslavia has resulted in an ambivalent attitude toward Yugoslav refugees. Nothing can strengthen a totalitarian power so successfully as the feeling of resignation and apathy among its subjects. When we challenge the refugees' motivations, we appear unable to grasp why people would be fleeing and we seem to be turning our backs on them. When we acquiesce in the forcible return of escapees, we contribute to the feeling of hopelessness and thereby weaken the democratic cause within Yugoslavia—and without.

The age and the social background of most of the Yugoslav refugees, predominantly working class with a good admixture of peasant youth, instead of being interpreted as a symptom of the failure of the Yugoslav Government to gain the allegiance of the strata in whose name it purports to rule, have been used as proof of the economic character of the refugees' escape motivations. The refugees' opposition to communism is being impugned because they are poor. And because, when asked what they intend to do, they express a desire to work and to earn decent wages, it is adduced that they are not victims of Communist oppression and have not suffered from the absence of personal, political, and religious freedom. It is as if the economic hardships to which they were exposed were not manmade, the result of Communist misplanning. And it is as if a desire to work and to earn a decent living were in itself improper and shameful, an attitude which calls for the label "economic" refugee, that is one who does not deserve our sympathy and can be returned behind the curtain without qualms. When misgivings do arise, they are dismissed, sometimes smugly and sometimes uneasily.

The kind of repression rather than the repression itself is considered, and no attention is paid to the possibility of later retribution and the certainty that people who express their dissatisfaction with the regime by trying to escape from it will remain marked as enemies of the state. It is forgotten that the very act of escape makes a man an enemy of the state.

Everyone knows that in Communist countries, the economy is a phase of politics. In those countries where people are not free to choose their own political creed, they are not free to make their own way in the social and economic field. Freedom of initiative is either nonexistent or is permitted on a minimum scale. Savings are meaningless because sooner or later the state swallows everything. Plans for the future are better left unmade. Everyone knows what civic and family life has been reduced to. Now, with all this, when someone escapes from such distressing conditions can he really be considered an economic refugee?

Is physical persecution necessarily physical torture? The loss of freedom, political pressure and its inevitable consequence, economic misery, are also persecution; veiled persecution, daily persecution, persecution which these young people feel deeply, although they are often unable to give ex-

pression to their feeling, for lack of education, or difficulty in choosing the right words.

Even those few Yugoslavs who are granted asylum are frequently put in a lower category than refugees from other Communist countries by the U.S. escapee program. Thus Yugoslavs either do not qualify as refugees or they are treated as second-class refugees.

And when they come before the so-called screening commissions in the West, having crossed their Rubicon, although they have, for very valid reasons, chosen to be, as it were, "without family, without country, and without means," the only thing they find to say is "We came away to be free and to find work." Then we say, "They are young, they ran away from their parents; discipline; they are, as you can see, economic refugees."

Should we not give the matter a little more thought? There are many who are discontented with their jobs or unemployed. Do you think that they would, even with a passport, i.e., without any risk to themselves, leave Belgium, for example, leave it forever, abandoning their families, their possessions, for the unknown?

A further contention is that by permitting Yugoslav refugees to stay in Western Europe or by accepting them for immigration in the Western Hemisphere, we are alleviating Communist Yugoslavia's economic problems and underemployment. If this were true, Tito could have done better by negotiating labor agreements with other European countries which have manpower shortages. The 10,000 refugees from Yugoslavia annually do not alter the employment picture inside Yugoslavia to any appreciable degree. Even if it were the policy of the West to aggravate the economic difficulties of Yugoslavia, as it clearly has not been, these goals should not be pursued at the expense of the refugees, the victims of Tito's brand of communism.

The repression of freedom of religion and other fundamental human rights in Yugoslavia hardly differs even in degree from that practiced in the U.S.S.R. itself.

Yet the subtle campaign of the Yugoslav authorities to popularize the term "economic" refugee has been more than successful. It has carried over into the language of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and that of certain officials of the U.S. Government. It has influenced the policy of countries which formerly granted asylum to these refugees to the point where substantial numbers of them are now being repatriated instead of welcomed. It has created a situation where Italy permits most of those fleeing to remain on its soil, but Austria, using U.S. equivocal policies as an excuse, forcibly returns the majority of the Yugoslav refugees. It has resulted in drastic reductions in U.S. aid to refugees from Yugoslavia. It has resulted in resentment by true democratic people from Yugoslavia who see U.S. aid helping to build a strong Communist state, but refusing to help those anti-Communist elements that escape its oppression. It has caused confusion among the Americans because policymakers fail to understand that the basic philosophy of the Communist state is the same, whether that of the Soviet Union, China, or Yugoslavia.

American policy today leaves refugees bewildered by its policy of being selective about the kind of communism and oppression from which a person must flee in order to benefit from the help of the American people.

At a time when we are granting asylum to thousands of refugees from Castro's communism, which, supported by Soviet communism, is threatening the Western Hemisphere, should the United States not take a forthright stand and give full recognition to the refugees fleeing Yugoslavia which is today linked again with the Soviet in its conspiracy to have communism dominate the world?

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most significant action taken by this Congress was the sweeping revision of our trade policies. As one of the supporters of the President's trade program, I believe that its provisions will result in great economic prosperity and development for this country and the other markets of the free world.

One of the best expositions of the problems of world trade in the 1960's and the relationship between the United States and the European Common Market was recently made by Mr. Hans H. Bohlmann, export manager of the Seamless Rubber Co., New Haven, Conn. Mr. Bohlmann spells out with clarity and effectiveness the historical development of the European Economic Community and its importance to our country. He is a recognized authority in this field and I commend his articulate and informative remarks to the especial attention of this House.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE EUROPEAN COMMON MARKET

(By Hans H. Bohlmann)

Europe is at last getting together—which to us in the United States, with our own vast open market, would have seemed to have been the logical thing to do a long time ago. The European Economic Community, better known as the European Common Market, created by the Treaty of Rome in 1957, provides that after a certain length of time goods of the member countries made up of France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, West Germany, and Italy can be sold without internal duties anywhere within the Community. No doubt the Swiss Federation and our own United States served as inspiring examples.

The 170 million consumers of the Common Market already have benefited so much from the initial cuts of internal tariffs that the rate of economic integration is now exceeding the original timetable. The latest tariff cut went into effect last month, raising the total to as high as 50 percent on industrial products. It is now hoped to eliminate all tariffs among the members by 1966, considerably ahead of the original schedule.

This is a momentous development, although plans for unifying Europe are not new. In the 19th century, for example, many notable and influential men such as Mazzini, Garibaldi, and Victor Hugo considered all Europeans as members of one family, with a background of similar traditions and culture. They complained about the lack of unity causing constant wars in which even the victors lost more than they gained.

The hope for unification disappeared with World War I. Nevertheless, in 1922 Aristide Briand, several times French Prime Minister, revived the idea of the unification of Europe and in 1926 the movement had made such progress that a Pan-European Congress took place in Vienna which 2,000 representatives of all the nations of Europe attended. As a result of that Congress the Pan-European Union was formed. Briand became honorary president of the Union. The second Congress took place in Berlin in 1930 and the third in Basle in 1932 at which time Winston Churchill expressed himself enthusiastically in favor of the idea of a United States of Europe although apparently he did not want the United Kingdom to be in-

cluded due to her ties with the British Commonwealth countries.

The advocates of a European union pointed to Switzerland as an example of a Pan-European in miniature. It seemed that the European union supported by 28 governments was going to realize its plan, but due to the rise of Hitler in 1933 the movement did not come back to life again until 1943 when Winston Churchill declared again his belief in a European union with all principal members of the Western European family as partners, and suggested the establishment of a Council of Europe with a supreme court that would decide on every dispute and would have sufficient power to see to it that the decision of the court would be carried out.

At the Potsdam Conference in 1945 President Truman supported the proposal of a union of Western European nations and in addition urged the unification of military forces and foreign policy.

On a 1953 business trip to Europe I met leaders of the Belgian Committee for the Creation of a United States of Europe. At that time the European Coal and Steel Community came into being under which the six countries of the present Common Market were pooling their steel and coal without assessing any internal import duties. I was given to understand that 8 out of 10 people in Belgium wanted a United States of Europe in one form or another, and I learned subsequently that there was great enthusiasm for this also in the other countries which now comprise the European Economic Community.

Due to the division of Europe in the past, there has been no free access to natural resources, but now, with lowered internal tariffs and increasing productivity as well as a higher standard of living in the Common Market, goods from all six member countries are increasingly being interchanged and at much lower prices than before. Manufacturers within this area are able to produce cheaper for the much larger market that will become even more attractive after a completely free movement of goods is achieved.

As economic integration progresses many problems will necessarily have to be ironed out due to difference in fiscal and labor policy for which reason the leaders of the Common Market foresee not only economic but also political integration. They feel that once full economic integration has been accomplished the matured economic ties can be relied upon as a tremendous force in helping achieve political unification in spite of a long history of frequently conflicting interests of the nations involved.

Some of the countries in the European Common Market have a low import duty at present but the average duty of the member countries will be reflected in a higher common customs tariff. For example, the low present duty rate of 4 percent ad valorem in West Germany on plumbing and heating equipment will be increased to 16 percent in the common customs tariff. Textile machinery now paying 6 percent duty in the Benelux countries (made up of Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) will be subject to 13 percent under the external customs tariff. Rubber goods in general paying 14 percent ad valorem import duty in West Germany will later have to hurdle a 22-percent EEC common tariff wall.

These examples are indicative of the handicap the external EEC tariff wall can become for many manufacturing exporters on the outside.

An organization somewhat similar to the Common Market is the European Free Trade Association or EFTA, consisting of the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Austria, Portugal, and Switzerland. The same as in the case of the six-nation Common Market, the EFTA, or so-called "Outer Seven" countries, aim at eventual complete liberaliza-

tion of trade with themselves. However, within the EFTA this applies to industrial products only, and whereas the Common Market countries are moving steadily toward increased economic and eventual political integration, EFTA, as set up by the 1960 Stockholm Convention, does not plan to have a common tariff wall against nonmembers nor a coordination of social and economic policies. Moreover, the EFTA has expressed an interest in promoting closer economic cooperation between the countries of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) which include the members of the European Economic Community. Therefore, the EFTA has recently announced a new reduction in internal duties on industrial products to keep pace with similar steps within the European Common Market.

As the products of most manufacturers outside EEC will be subject to higher duties than before and face competition from similar goods made locally on which no duties at all are paid, members of the EFTA, led by Britain, are negotiating for membership in EEC or associate membership. They see in advance that their economies will suffer drastically if they stay on the outside, and from visits to these countries I have learned that many industrialists there are hopeful that EFTA will be instrumental in reaching an agreement to join the Common Market.

Negotiations by Britain to reach a provisional agreement were interrupted recently over the question of pricing and gradual assessment of duties on imports into the Common Market of foodstuffs from the Commonwealth. In this regard EEC has offered to assist underdeveloped Commonwealth countries such as Pakistan and India in adjusting to a future tariff wall. Negotiations are scheduled to be resumed in October and there are wide differences of opinion as to when a final agreement on Britain's entry into the EEC may come about. The earliest guess is perhaps sometime in 1963.

Whereas in the European Common Market free trade serves to merge the economies of the member countries, this is not possible in Eastern Europe because trading there is done by the state. Import and export accounts between any two Communist nations must balance since none of their currencies are convertible. Thus the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance or Comecon, comprising Moscow's East European satellites and Outer Mongolia, cannot lead to effective economic integration. For example, Moscow usually buys from its Eastern European satellites at lower prices than it pays to West European countries for similar goods. Besides, when the Soviets sell comparable goods to both East Europe and West Europe, the Communist satellites generally pay more. As the economies of the bloc countries are not complementary, further forced economic integration could violate existing trade relations with Common Market countries which in that case would be likely to retaliate. Already Czechoslovakia and Poland are reported to be resisting further economic integration into the Soviet bloc.

The Common Market, with its internal economic cooperation and pooling of enormous raw material reserves, not only contradicts Communist ideas about capitalism but also their expressed statements to the effect that capitalist states are headed toward destructive competition. Therefore, the economic progress of EEC has already put the Soviet Union on the defensive, as has the Common Market's aim of eventual political union with a resulting increase in military power. How much Moscow is disturbed by these developments can be seen from its recent attacks on the Common Market at meetings and at press conferences. At a reception given for the Italian Foreign Trade Minister in Moscow in June, Premier Khrushchev urged Italy to

withdraw from EEC and also from NATO and to trade with the Soviet Union.

Thus the Communist economic offensive is, in effect, being countered by the success of the EEC which has also impressed neutral nations in Africa and elsewhere who can see the economic advantages of trade relations with the Common Market rather than with the Soviet bloc to the exclusion of others.

Now let us examine what effect European integration and the resulting common tariff wall is likely to have on American exports. As far as raw materials are concerned, which represent about 25 percent of our current total exports to Europe, the effect is apt to be negligible since import duties in Western Europe are generally low. Coal exports, too, will probably continue on about the same scale as heretofore of roughly 21 percent of our total exports to Europe, although oil from the Sahara, for the transportation of which pipelines are now being built, may eventually reduce U.S. coal exports. American coal continues to be one of the leading sources of first-class coking and energy coal for industry in Europe as extensive automation permits the distribution of U.S. bituminous coal to European consumers at prices below those of most European producers.

Shipments of food products which have been running at about 19 percent of total U.S. exports to Europe may increase as European dietary tastes change with the increasing standard of living. Tobacco exports included in this group are expected to remain at present levels for some time to come.

When it comes to U.S. exports of manufactured goods, however, such as motor cars and aircraft, electric household appliances and office equipment, agricultural machinery and mining tools, pharmaceutical products and chemical fertilizers, they are likely to diminish as European integration progresses, and Common Market manufacturers have the advantage of a higher EEC external tariff wall.

It is primarily to meet this situation that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 has been designed. After passing the House of Representatives by a substantial margin on June 28, the 5-year bill went to the Senate where it was passed yesterday, September 19, by a vote of 78 to 8. Thus the United States will now be able to bargain with strength for reciprocal reductions up to 50 percent in existing duties and for the gradual elimination of tariffs on those items where the enlarged Common Market (including Britain) and the United States account for 80 percent of the free world's trade.

The new trade bill is also intended to assist the expansion of trade of the less-developed countries by eliminating all duties on tropical agricultural and forestry products not produced in the United States, provided similar reductions are instituted by the EEC. A byproduct of such strengthening of the economies of countries in this group is that they will become less vulnerable to the Soviet economic offensive.

For quite a few years an ever larger number of American manufacturers has been entering into licensing agreements or making direct investments in branch plants or joint ventures with European firms in the EEC or EFTA areas, when it became apparent that that was the only way of remaining in the market and of expanding local sales. As Common Market internal tariffs are lowered further and the external tariffs are raised, this may induce additional U.S. private capital investments within the Common Market. On the other hand, if as expected the external EEC tariffs are bargained down under the Trade Expansion Act, the resulting increased sales opportunities for U.S. products may well make it much less attractive for American manufacturers to establish new subsidiary plants inside the Common Market. This in turn will not only help increase U.S. exports and employment

but also improve our current adverse balance of payments caused by foreign aid and military expenditures as well as by the outflow of American investments. The tariff reductions will be negotiated by the United States in the same across-the-board way on broad categories of goods as the members of the EEC are doing in gradually reducing their internal tariffs.

New U.S. tariff negotiations will continue on the traditional most-favored-nation principle whereby concessions agreed upon will apply as well to other free world trading countries. Thus the negotiating power under the trade bill in reducing our tariffs in return for similar concessions will help expand our trade also with other parts of the free world.

These expected tariff reductions should increase our exports to Europe more than our imports from the area because the fairly recent removal of European import restrictions on many American products has created opportunities for expanding U.S. exports. European sales to us, on the other hand, have already been expanding for about 10 years and little further increases can be expected for some time to come.

Another factor favoring more American exports is that here in the United States of America we have long been geared to mass production and distribution which is something quite new to Europe. Therefore, with a shortage of labor and with wages rising more rapidly in the EEC than over here, there will be good export possibilities for advanced U.S. capital equipment and other goods. The reduction of trade barriers under the Trade Expansion Act should prove particularly helpful to companies of all sizes now selling specialized products successfully in the domestic market. Accordingly, they should be able to do very nicely also in developing sales of their goods abroad.

In President Kennedy's July 4 declaration of interdependence between the United States and Western Europe, including Britain, he called for closer ties between the two sides, involving a more equitable sharing of the financial responsibilities of the new partnership such as assuming more of the economic aid to the underdeveloped areas and a greater portion of the military expenditures now incurred by the United States in behalf of European defense against the Communist bloc.

Under the auspices of the Atlantic Institute in Paris, economists will make a study of the different aspects of the proposed economic partnership between a unified Western Europe and the United States. This includes the common policies and guarantees that should be developed to bring about the drastic lowering of tariff walls, as foreseen in the U.S. trade expansion bill.

In line with the national export expansion program, we are constantly being reminded from all sides that our national survival depends partly on keeping our exports flowing in increasing volume to ease the pressure on our international balance of payments. In this respect the claim that our goods are too expensive for the world market is contradicted by the fact that our merchandise exports currently exceed our imports by about \$5¼ billion and that our vast domestic market enables us to produce many goods more economically than our foreign competitors who often pay much lower wages than we. In fact, competition between U.S. industry and European Common Market industry in the world market will stimulate even greater production efficiency and increased overall productivity.

The new opportunities opening up in the Common Market are of tremendous importance for American manufacturers. It is estimated that so far only about 12,000 American companies are exporting, but that another 100,000 have products that can be sold abroad. Of course, it is up to each

firm to make the effort to secure some of the business. There are sales opportunities in Western Europe and in practically every country of the free world that can be tapped through systematic market investigation and coverage.

Increased imports into the United States may require some American manufacturers to make changes in their products to meet competition. Those U.S. industries that may be injured by imports can obtain relief under the Trade Expansion Act in the form of aid in adjusting their products to meet the new situation and in connection with retraining programs.

The legislation under the new trade expansion bill is necessary especially at this time because it will facilitate an increase in American exports to the European Economic Community before its common tariff wall against the United States and other outside countries has reached its full height and before the Common Market members have become accustomed to it.

Those American manufacturers who have heretofore been considering exports as a relatively unimportant part of their business are missing a good bet. They remind me of the college freshman who telegraphed his sister: "Failed four exams. Prepare Dad." His sister wired back, "Dad prepared; prepare yourself." Those companies that have prepared themselves by having an export business with resulting bigger sales and profits have weathered recessions in the past far better than those with only domestic sales. As business cycles overseas usually do not coincide with ours, exports are in effect an insurance against recessions, especially now that dramatic new export sales opportunities are opening up due to the growing economic strength of Western Europe and other parts of the free world. Businessmen wanting to exploit these opportunities can obtain much help from the U.S. Department of Commerce which includes assistance to newcomers in developing an export business. In this connection the commercial sections of American Foreign Service posts are well prepared to aid visiting international traders with their marketing problems.

There is one service in particular which for years has been very useful to me on overseas business trips. By supplying my itinerary to the Commerce Department, the Foreign Service posts are alerted to my approximate date of arrival and to any problems I may want to work out. In this way valuable time is saved and in addition overseas branches and correspondents of American banks can also be extremely helpful.

An excellent means of building export sales can be through participation in U.S. exhibits at international trade fairs in principal trading centers of Western Europe and elsewhere. American trade missions are also effective because they will assist manufacturers, upon request, through the U.S. Department of Commerce in locating firms or individuals interested in acting as their agents or distributors.

Another aid to expanding exports is the new export credit insurance system administered by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association (FCIA) providing protection against political and commercial risks. As you may know, FCIA shares the commercial risks with the Export-Import Bank and the latter carries the political risks.

Thus, with the aid already available, most American exporters can expect the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to assist them substantially in increasing their sales not only to the original six-country Common Market but also to a subsequent larger European Economic Community including Britain and other West European countries that will embrace about 300 million consumers.

Accordingly, American business should gain tremendously from an expanded trade program because of its stimulating effect on

our economy even in the face of increased imports since the latter will be a challenge to American industry to remain competitive. These imports will also benefit the American consumer as he will be able to buy at lower prices from a greater selection of goods. We all enjoy imported merchandise.

Mounting economic strength and a higher standard of living in the European Economic Community could well increase the demand for American goods to such an extent that it may offset any reduction in U.S. export sales that may occur in the beginning in certain kinds of goods. This is illustrated by the experience of many exporters who are now receiving orders for products that only several years ago would have been impossible to obtain. Of course, this reflects the greater buying power of people in Western Europe who can now indulge in a taste for a wider variety of imported goods.

Accordingly, those companies that actively go after sales abroad by offering top quality merchandise at the right price and realistic payment terms as well as speedy delivery are bound to expand their businesses and strengthen the country as a whole.

If I don't stop now I'll be like the lecturer who at the end of his talk finally asked, "Are there any questions?" A hand shot up and one of the long-suffering listeners inquired, "What time is it?"

WILLIAM C. DOHERTY: FIRST AMBASSADOR TO JAMAICA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that President Kennedy has made any nomination for high office during his administration to this time that has received such unanimous and enthusiastic approval from the membership of both Houses of the Congress than his nomination of William C. Doherty as this country's first Ambassador to Jamaica.

During his 21 years as president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, William C. Doherty has earned the respect and the friendship of every Member of both Houses—and on both sides of the aisle of both Houses of the Congress. He has been a peerless leader of men. He has built his organization into a showcase union for the entire labor movement in America, an example of integrity and effectiveness. Probably no man in the country, excepting only those who have actually been Members of the Congress, has as many friends on Capitol Hill as has Bill Doherty.

But, in commending this nomination I am, for the moment disregarding personal matters of friendship, although these considerations are great. I commend this nomination because of its logic and its tremendous good sense.

For the past 17 years, in his capacity as a major vice president, first of the old American Federation of Labor and, since the amalgamation in 1955, of the AFL-CIO, Bill Doherty's career has been an intensive and magnificent training ground for the job for which he has been nominated.

In 1945, for instance, Gen. Lucius D. Clay invited him to Germany to assist in the reestablishment of the free trade

union movement which had been killed during the Hitler reign of terror. Bill Doherty had a great deal to do with uncovering Communist elements in certain unions in Germany and these unions, as a result, were driven behind the Iron Curtain where they are still operating as propaganda outlets of the international Communist conspiracy.

In 1945 also he attended the British Trade Union Congress in Blackpool, England, as a fraternal delegate. He impressed his British colleagues so well that he was afforded the very rare honor of being invited back again for a second visit in 1959. It should be added at this point that his work in England earned him the close friendship of his fellow trade unionist Ernest Bevin, who later became Great Britain's highly regarded Foreign Minister.

Ever since 1951 Bill Doherty has been a principal figure in the Postal Telegraph & Telephone International, an intensely effective anti-Communist trade secretariat of communications workers throughout the free world. His top-level activity in this trade secretariat has been a major force in frustrating the efforts of Communists to infiltrate and control the communications workers in key countries. In fact, just last month in Denver, William Norton, a former president of the PTTI, and a man who twice has served as Deputy Prime Minister of his native land of Ireland, paid tribute to Bill Doherty as the one man in the entire world who has given the most direction to struggle against communistic influence which the Postal Telegraph & Telephone International has been carrying on since the end of World War II.

Bill Doherty has been preaching the gospel of democracy and the free enterprise system on a person-to-person level within the trade unions where susceptibility to the siren-song of the collectivists was greatest. He has been one of the most effective freedom fighters in the labor movement in Latin America and has carried the anti-Communist battle in those greatly troubled and highly important neighbor nations that lie south of us.

His natural genius for international affairs has been recognized by two Presidents of the United States of different political faiths. In 1956 President Dwight D. Eisenhower appointed him to the official U.S. party attending the inauguration ceremonies of President Juscelino Kubitschek de Oliveira of Brazil. Former Vice President Richard M. Nixon was the leader of this mission.

In 1961, President Kennedy appointed him as a special representative to the highly important conference at Punta del Este, Uruguay. Bill Doherty's performance there was so impressive that the President, just last August, appointed him as Special Ambassador to the Independence Day ceremonies in Kingston, Jamaica. This mission was headed by Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

Once again, Bill Doherty's work on this mission was so effective that the

nomination as Ambassador to Jamaica was a "natural."

But, there are many more reasons why Bill Doherty's nomination makes great good sense, over and above the reasons I have cited. First of all, Bill Doherty is a trade unionist of great experience and great reputation. He is perhaps even more widely known in Latin America and in Europe than he is in the United States because of his unremitting opposition to dictatorship, to tyranny of any political shade or coloration, to totalitarianism of either the left or the right. Jamaica, the land to which he is being assigned as Ambassador, is a country in which organized labor is the dominant political force.

Sir Alexander Bustamante, the Jamaican Prime Minister, is a longtime leader of union labor.

Both major political parties in Jamaica are closely aligned with labor.

In Jamaica, Bill Doherty will be speaking to the political leaders in their own ideological and sociological language, the language they understand. This is an inestimable advantage, an advantage that no career diplomat could possibly possess.

There is a further consideration and this is geographical. Fidel Castro's Cuba lies just 90 miles away from Jamaica, and the Communist leaders of that unhappy land are already casting greedy eyes on the Jamaican shores. The Communist pressures on the emerging nation of Jamaica are bound to be enormous and I say: "Thank God we have an Ambassador who is ideally equipped, enormously experienced, and prodigiously endowed with courage and integrity who can fight these pressures in our behalf."

Mr. Speaker, this is a brilliant appointment. I know that the vast majority of the Members of this body wish to congratulate William C. "Bill" Doherty on being the first representative from the ranks of organized labor in this country to be raised to ambassadorial rank. But—as a member of the opposite political party I want to extend my warm congratulations to the President, John F. Kennedy, for having the imagination, the wisdom, and the foresight to nominate such an outstandingly qualified American citizen for this extremely important mission to a very important sector of our hemisphere.

I shall miss the smiling, cheery countenance of Bill Doherty, as will many of my colleagues. Because of his absence from the Capitol Hill scene there will be a little void. And in some of the social gatherings which Bill presided over as President of the NAACP, I shall also miss his fine Irish tenor voice singing "Beautiful Ohio" and "My Wild Irish Rose."

To Bill Doherty, his charming and wonderful wife, and his lovely family, go my prayers and best wishes for continued good health, happiness, and success.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 2, 19, 44, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, and 54 to the bill (H.R. 12648) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1447) entitled "An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3451) entitled "An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing

votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 10620) entitled "An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12135) entitled "An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12276) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to Senate amendments numbered 1, 8, and 11 to the above-entitled bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 12648, with Senate amendments Nos. 2, 19, 44, and 47 through 54, further disagree to said amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, may I proceed for one moment?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the membership that we have had preliminary discussions with our colleagues on the other side, and if you will bear with us, I am sure it will be only a matter of a very few minutes until we will be able to be back with an agreement, because we have discussed and we understand each other. If you will just bear with us and stay on the floor for a few minutes longer, I think we can be back shortly. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, CANNON, HORAN, and TABER.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I had preliminarily indicated what I felt and appealed to the membership to stay on the floor. I should have asked the Speaker if it would be all right to consider this later in the day.

I now assure the Speaker that it will be but a very brief time before we will

be back, and I hope we can have unanimous consent to take this matter up in a few moments when we return.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF ST. AUGUSTINE QUADRICENTENNIAL COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 87-586, the Chair appoints as members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission the following Members on the part of the House: Mr. MATTHEWS of Florida and Mr. CRAMER of Florida.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares a recess until 5:30 o'clock p.m.

Thereupon, at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m., the House stood in recess until 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2554)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 19, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, and 54.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 47, 51, and 53.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
MILTON R. YOUNG,
KARL E. MUNDT,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12648)

making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Research Service

Amendment No. 2.—Research: Reported in disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur with an amendment which will include the following Senate increases and amounts to which the conferees have agreed:

Research:

To staff new research laboratories.....	\$325,000
Cost of production research.....	670,000
Expanded utilization research.....	4,875,000
	<hr/>
	5,870,000

Construction:

Soil and water facilities, Sidney, Mont.....	395,000
Soil and water facilities, Mandan, N. Dak.....	400,000
Soil and water facilities, Watkinsville, Ga.....	125,000
Entomology and crop facilities, Tucson, Ariz.....	\$585,000
Tree fruit and nut crops facilities, Byron, Ga.....	500,000
Small fruit facilities, Carbondale, Ill.....	165,000
Modernization of facilities, Beltsville, Md.....	160,000
Poultry research facilities, East Lansing, Mich.....	450,000
	<hr/>
	2,780,000

Total increases.....	8,650,000
House bill total.....	77,473,000
Total 1963 appropriation.....	86,123,000

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 19.—Construction of facilities: Eliminates \$1,600,000 for research facilities in Georgia.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 44.—Reimbursement for net realized losses: Appropriates \$2,278,455,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$2,066,955,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Foreign assistance programs

Amendments Nos. 47 through 50.—Public Law 480: Include language inserted by the Senate and appropriate \$1,080,632,000 under title I as proposed by the House instead of \$700,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$250,000,000 under title II as proposed by the House instead of \$189,000,000 as proposed by the Senate and \$40,000,000 under title IV as proposed by the House instead of \$50,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 51 and 52.—International Wheat Agreement: Restore House language, insert Senate language, and appropriate \$81,218,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$15,650,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 53 and 54.—Bartered materials for supplemental stockpile: Restore House language, insert Senate language, and appropriate \$125,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$92,867,000 as proposed by the Senate.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
WALT HORAN,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill H.R. 12648 and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, the two bodies having agreed on most of the items in this bill, there are only a few items left in disagreement.

Briefly, in the report which we have brought to you, on which both sides have agreed, the Senate has receded on the \$1,600,000 for the peanut laboratory. They have receded on the \$17,500,000 of unearmarked funds for construction under utilization research. They have gone along with the House figures on financing price supports for a full year instead of a half year.

The House in turn has agreed to go along with \$1,775,000 for five research laboratories added by the Senate. Insofar as the figures in disagreement for the actual running of the Department are concerned, we have tied down all the funds that are approved. In substitution for the peanut laboratory we have gone along with the other five which were added in the other body. I think that on the whole this will enable the Department to operate on a sound basis for the coming year.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and the conferees on this side for the splendid work they have done and for their determination to stand by the position of the House of Representatives on this bill. I realize this was done under great pressure and they were subject to unjustified criticism. I extend to you my thanks for your work in this connection.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman for his comment and wish to assure him that in the final analysis we had the cooperation of the folks on both sides of the Capitol. We think we have reached what can be termed a fair solution of a difficult problem.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FOUNTAIN. I, too, want to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], and all of the House conferees for the splendid job they have done in sustaining the position of the House. There has not been an easy task, as we all know.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank my colleague.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HORAN].

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, the only comment I have to make is in behalf of my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN]. In this conference we were faced with a rather difficult task. I think he carried off his duties with dignity and with some concern for the taxpayers' dollars. I do think that in this Congress of ours we should have processes of orderly and controlled appropriations. I said before and I say now, I do not think a person can serve on the Appropriations Committee and win any popularity contests if he does his job seriously. I am concerned with the budget. I have developed an allergy against red ink. I may retire from the House one of these days—now I will be frank with you, I do not want to retire on a 10-cent dollar. When the final report is made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], I think you are going to find that we have spent more than we have taken in, as measured by any system of budgeting that we might consider in this country. I just say that as we make this report to you, I think you owe a debt of gratitude for the hard work JAMIE WHITTEN has put in on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I know it has been a pleasure for me to work with him. With as much knowledge as we could bring to bear on this matter, we bring back to you a final conference report that we hope meets the needs of American agriculture. That is all I have to say at this time, but I do want to pledge to you that if I am reelected and remain a member of the Committee on Appropriations, that we will continue to consider our duties on this committee, which is an agency of this House, and that it will be done to the best of my ability and with some idea as to maintaining the fiscal solvency of the United States.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the statement of my friend and colleague from the State of Washington. Through the years we have worked together on this subcommittee. At present he is the ranking Republican member. Earlier today some speeches were made with reference to his predecessor who served many years in this capacity, the gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, who has rendered a real service to American agriculture. I say for the record that the conference this year was handled for the minority by my colleague, the gentleman from Washington. Certainly I know, as is evidenced by the conference report which is now before you, he will do a fine job for the American people and for American agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, may I say for the record that we have never approached this bill in a partisan manner and I know that we never will.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert a table in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The table is as follows:

H.R. 12648—Department of Agriculture and related agencies appropriation bill, 1963

Item	Budget estimates	Passed House	Passed Senate	Conference action	Conference action compared with—		
					Budget estimate	House	Senate
Title I—General activities.....	\$1,510,069,000	\$1,464,582,500	\$1,513,856,000	\$1,485,319,500	—\$24,749,500	+\$20,737,000	—\$28,536,500
Title II—Credit agencies.....	55,324,000	44,406,000	44,606,000	44,606,000	—10,718,000	+200,000	
Title III—Corporations.....	2,602,455,000	2,390,004,000	2,160,004,600	2,380,254,000	—222,201,000	—9,750,000	—211,250,000
Title IV—Foreign assistance programs.....	2,186,935,000	1,576,850,000	1,047,517,000	1,576,850,000	—610,085,000		+529,333,000
Total appropriations.....	6,354,783,000	5,475,842,500	4,774,983,000	5,487,029,500	—867,753,500	+11,187,000	+712,046,500
Total loan authorizations.....	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	(+15,000,000)	

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 2: Page 3, line 9, strike out:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, \$77,473,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a);".

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, \$106,126,500, including such amounts as may be necessary, notwithstanding the foregoing limitations, to remain available until expended, for the construction, alteration, and equipping of facilities and acquisition of the necessary land therefor by purchase, donation or exchange: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a);".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted, insert the following:

"Research: For research and demonstrations on the production and utilization of agricultural products, home economics, and related research and services, and for acquisition of land by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed \$100, \$77,473,000; plus additional amounts for research as follows: \$325,000 for staffing new research laboratories, \$670,000 for research on cost of production, and \$4,875,000 for expanded utilization research; and plus the following amounts, to remain available until expended, for construction, alteration and equipping of facilities: \$395,000 for soil and water research facilities at Sidney, Montana, \$450,000 for poultry research facilities at East Lansing, Michigan, \$400,000 for Mandan, North Dakota, \$125,000 for the Southern Piedmont soil and water facility, \$585,000 for Tucson, Arizona, \$500,000 for the regional tree fruit and nut crops station in the Southeast, \$165,000 for the research station at Carbondale, Illinois, and \$160,000 for

improvement of heating, water and electrical systems at the Agricultural Research Center at Beltsville, Maryland; in all, \$86,123,000: *Provided*, That the limitations contained herein shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113(a));".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 47: Page 32, line 4, after "recoverable," insert "and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon,".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 47 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 51: Page 32, line 16, strike out "expenses during fiscal year 1963" and insert "unrecovered prior years' cost, including interest thereon,".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years' cost, including interest thereon,".

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 53: Page 32, line 22, strike out "expenses during fiscal year 1963" and insert "unrecovered prior years' costs".

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "expenses during fiscal year 1963 and unrecovered prior years' costs".

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

INCREASE DEDUCTIONS ON MEDICAL AND DENTAL EXPENSES

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the part of the House may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report on the bill (H.R. 10620) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, and so forth, expenses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

1ST LT. CHARLES M. COX

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1961) for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army, retired.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. LANE. This bill would relieve a retired Army man of liability to pay \$6,800.58 representing payments of longevity pay based upon credit for service in the New York organized militia from January 1920 to October 1926. This was based upon a certificate of service made during World War II in 1942. The payments were spread over the years from 1942 through 1960.

The Department of the Army found that the man has been subjected to a severe financial hardship by reason of this liability. The Army has no objection to the bill.

Mr. BATTIN. This is the general type of legislation where a mistake was made, and it would be at this time a hardship upon the man to have to repay something through an error that was not his fault?

Mr. LANE. That is true, and that is what the record shows.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, as I understand it this bill and the bill that follows provide there will be no collection of

overpayments from each of these individuals.

Once again we have before us the administrative failures that have resulted in overpayments to these two Army officers. I want to renew again my protest—I shall not object to these bills—to the fact that nowhere have I been able to discover in the report on this bill any showing that anyone has been held responsible, that there has been any penalization of those who made these administrative errors.

I hope in the next session of Congress we will begin to get reports where responsibility for errors has been fixed.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, United States Army (retired), of Buxton, Oregon, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$6,800.58, representing the amount of overpayments of longevity pay received by him for the period from June 1, 1942, through March 13, 1960, while the said Lieutenant Charles M. Cox was serving as a member of the United States Army, such overpayments having been made as a result of his being erroneously credited, for pay purposes, with service performed in the organized militia of the State of New York.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said First Lieutenant Charles M. Cox, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in the first section of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. GUSTAVE M. MINTON, JR.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3124) for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand this bill is about the same as the last one where an administrative error was made?

Mr. LANE. Yes. This error was found in 1961 for the first time and goes back to 1918, 1919, and 1920. It is similar to the other bill I just brought up.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Gustave M. Minton, Junior, lieutenant colonel, United States Air Force (AO915777), is relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the sum of \$2,822.85, repre-

senting the amount of overpayments of basic pay received by him for the period from August 22, 1952, through December 31, 1961, while he was serving as a member of the United States Air Force, such overpayments having been made as a result of administrative error.

Sec. 2. The Comptroller General of the United States, or his designee, shall relieve disbursing officers, including special disbursing agents of the Army, Navy, and Air Force from accountability or responsibility for any payments described in section 1 of this Act, and shall allow credits in the settlement of the accounts of those officers or agents for payments which are found to be free from fraud and collusion.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gustave M. Minton, Junior, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the overpayments referred to in section 1 of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FUTURE PLANNING FOR THE NATION'S CAPITAL

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the best, clearest, commonsense statements that I have read on the Nation's Capital is the address of Philip L. Graham delivered last evening at the 25th anniversary dinner of the Washington Building Congress. Under unanimous consent, I include the statement with my remarks:

ADDRESS BY PHILIP GRAHAM BEFORE BUILDING CONGRESS

Our Nation's Capital has never been at a loss for planners and prophets.

The first act of prophecy about our city and its future was made 171 years ago by a planner, Maj. Pierre Charles L'Enfant. He conceived of the Capital of this Revolutionary Republic in the grand baroque manner of 17th century European monarchy.

While we may question L'Enfant's sense of history—it is difficult—even after nearly two centuries—to question his sheer genius as a physical planner.

L'Enfant was a far shrewder visionary than any among the generations of his successors. His plan was in fact compelling enough to be revived a full century after it was grudgingly received by our first President and all but torn to pieces by the land speculators of those days.

L'Enfant, luckily for him, started with nothing. Some of our contemporary planners seem to feel that they too are starting with nothing—a strange and delusive way, of thinking about the 1960's.

Today we have still another plan, this one for the National Capital region of 38 years hence—our plan for the year 2000. And this is what I want to talk about tonight.

LOOKING BACK

The year 2000 is 38 years off. Let's skip back 38 years and see how prescient the lesser breed of L'Enfant's were when they planned for the year 1962 back in the early twenties.

They, like us today, were merely human beings, not seventh sons of seventh sons. Thus, their population projection from that era showed that no one had any idea of the revolutionary changes—the urban explosion, if you will—that would transform the Federal City into a metropolis stretching from Leesburg to Upper Marlboro and from Bowie to Manassas.

Although our research could not turn up forecasts that were actually made in 1924, we did discover that as late as 1930 the experts were confident that the District of Columbia in 1962 would still hold some 60 percent of the metropolitan population.

What has actually happened? Nearly two-thirds of the population has migrated to the suburbs.

The prognosticators of more than three decades ago foresaw a metropolitan population of 1.5 million people in 1962—with 875,000 of these numbers housed inside the District and 625,000 in the suburbs.

MISSING THE MARK

As it turned out, our suburbs are well over the million-and-a-quarter mark and suburban growth rates have not abated. So you see the suburban growth projections were a mere 200 percent off the mark.

Of course, the science of population was still in its bow-and-arrow stage back in the twenties. It is no surprise that the arrow went so wide of its mark.

After all, it was shot from a world in which airplanes lumbered along at less than 150 miles an hour; where mass dispersion of buying power was undreamed of for such amenities as washing machines, refrigerators, air conditioners, cars, and even homes; a world in which radio was still in its infancy and television unknown.

And in the District there existed ghetto boundaries for the Negro population which everyone thought would remain fixed in perpetuity.

Back in 1924 there was no comprehensive planning as such. And officials were only dimly aware of the beginnings of those two forces which would profoundly alter the face of our city—the automobile and urban sprawl.

MORE VEHICLES

There were about 100,000 motor vehicles on our streets in 1924. There are 700,000 today.

Commissioner James F. Oyster was warning in 1924 that within 5 years the municipal authorities may be turning to the possibilities of underground parking and the creation of parking hotels to get some of the machines off the streets during the hours of the day.

In 1924 steam shovels were crunching into such remote spots as Klingle Ford and Piney Branch within 3 miles of the White House to clear the way for new homes and apartment houses.

At the 59th anniversary meeting of the Association of Oldest Inhabitants, Col. Clarence O. Sherrill, officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, lamented that Piney Branch has been completely destroyed.

Each year, Sherrill protested, the dumping and denuding of the (city's) forested areas has progressively continued.

In the year when the foxtrots was king, when Coolidge was reelected President, when a new Ford touring car sold for \$295—the citizens of Washington were only beginning to show any awareness of the need for civic leadership to guide the great new thrust of development that came with prosperity.

COMMITTEE ROLE

Their concern showed itself in formation of the Committee of One Hundred and the National Capital Park Commission. But in the 38 ensuing years neither organization has been able to play a vital role in the National Capital area's development.

How did the District respond in 1924 to the storm warnings of change and growth?

Except for a handful of farsighted citizens, the prevailing preoccupation was with the cosmetic needs of our streets, parks, and monuments rather than corrective surgery. The dominant desire was to make the Capital City a place of monumental beauty surpassing Paris and Vienna.

Thoroughly in the spirit of the time, the Washington Post declared editorially that Washington "is going bravely forward to the Augustan age of its development."

And yet one prophetic soul—an obscure assistant engineer commissioner, Capt. John E. Wood—recognized that needs of the new age would cut far deeper than mere physical ornamentation and display.

"MUSTS" OF 1924

In 1924, after 4 years of service to the city, Wood drew up this remarkable farsighted list of "must" endeavors:

1. Development of the Washington Channel waterfront.
2. Acquisition and development of the Potomac Palisades.
3. Completion of a metropolitan plan embracing the Maryland and Virginia suburbs.
4. Construction of radial boulevards into the city.
5. Construction of belt highways in the suburbs to bypass congested residential areas and connect parkland.
6. Special architectural treatment for sections of the city such as Georgetown.

Wood was especially emphatic about the need for a beltway system as a "key to the plan of Greater Washington." Today we can take rueful measure of his warning that "further delay in establishing a proper plan for Washington outside Florida Avenue will mean glowing opportunities lost and tragedy invited."

But no one—not even the perceptive Captain Wood—suggested that Washington would benefit from a subway system which had already been tried and proven in other world capitals. Even as late as the New Deal era when land was cheap and massive public works were needed to combat unemployment, the city's first detailed plans for a subway were laughed into oblivion.

LOOKING AHEAD

So much for planning and prophesying in 1924. The truth is that no one was then trying to plan or capable of planning 38 years ahead.

In 1962 are we any more capable of planning, in detail, for 38 years from now? Are we so sure we have inherited the vision and talent of L'Enfant? Of course, we must have goals, long-term goals. But are we not better advised to temper our detailed planning to a period within our foresight and tangible grasp?

Let's look ahead to the year 2000.

Most of you are familiar with the year 2000 plan.

As a rough-sketch statement of goals toward which we may grow over the next four decades, it isn't bad.

Suburban planners and politicians have responded well to the notion of fixed growth corridors to permit balanced patterns of urban growth and open space.

But I must confess that I have fears about the actual operative effects of the year 2000 plan.

We are already seeing it used as an opiate by planners and by out and out obstructionists to tranquilize us against our day-to-day and year-to-year problems. In some quarters it is being invoked as holy writ to justify delay and deferral on decisions for the critical needs of today and 5 years from today.

OLD ARMY GAME

A military friend once told me of an old army gamesmanship device to avoid making

decisions. If you're assigned a problem, he said, all you have to do is make it so big that everyone finally agrees it's insoluble.

The so-called year 2000 plan is being used in just this fashion. It has been grasped by too many of our planning policymakers and technicians to sidestep painful but necessary controversy. It has been exploited by the philosophers of negativity.

One troublesome aspect of our current year 2000 planning is that it treats the central city as a sort of hole in the doughnut. Our planning sights must be set in the central city, in the midst of the forces that shape metropolitan development, rather than at the periphery. How can we intelligently tell where our development spokes should go if we haven't planned the hub of the system, our metropolitan core?

And the truth is that we haven't faced other most fundamental development issues within the District of Columbia in the year 2000 plan or anywhere else.

GAPS IN POLICY

For example: Although we have a so-called plan for 38 years hence, we still have no existing policy to control the development of our most treasured asset, the Potomac Valley from Great Falls to Mount Vernon.

Is it any surprise that one controversy chases another down the shoreline—the battle of Merrywood, the battle of Watergate Towne and even our bridge controversies?

When we fasten our eyes on the next millennium we are piling new atrocities on the old mistakes. Our most precious visual heritage, the vista of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials as well as the Washington Monument, have already been defiled by commercial excrescences of unsurpassed ugliness along the Georgetown waterfront.

And just as the monumental skyline sweeps into view from Whitehurst Freeway, our nostrils tell us that we have entered the foulest pocket of industrially polluted air in the city. Perhaps we ought to post a roadside warning to out-of-town motorists: "You are entering a monumental area. Hold your nose."

Still further downstream, along Rock Creek Parkway, comes the reek of raw sewage from one of the world's filthiest rivers—a monument itself to what has been called our effluent society.

HUMAN NEEDS

Yes, we have an image for the year 2000. But meanwhile who has devised a way for a \$65-a-week wage earner with three kids in an urban renewal area to qualify for a section 221 rehabilitation loan today, or next year, or 5 years from now?

How will the plan unsnarl tomorrow's traffic jam along Shirley Highway created by a Federal agency that decided to plunk down a major employment center at, say, Cameron Station in Alexandria?

How will it provide "decent, safe, and sanitary housing" next year for families chased out of their homes by a big new motel in midtown, by a freeway, or by the latest brainstorm of our Capitol Architect?

What can we find in the year 2000 plan to take care of the blight factor that we are building into our new Southwest right now by not providing parking to go with the thousands of Federal employees flocking into the new office buildings along Independence Avenue?

What should we do about the Anacostia River which has been completely ignored as another great natural asset of our region as a planning tool for revitalizing a section of Washington that has been left to rot? Should it have a 20- or 40-foot channel? How should we treat its shoreline? Must we also despoil the lovely and neglected Arboretum?

PRESENTING PLEA

I simply want to make this plea.

Let's not take the year 2000 plan for what it is not—an answer to problems that are now on the frying pan.

We must not be tranquilized into a sense of complacency that Washington's pressing issues have been solved on paper and that all we need to do is follow our blueprint down the garden—or the corridor—path.

Ten years ago I was invited to your birthday and I spoke to you of the serious, costly, and dangerous problems that lay ahead for our city. In almost every respect, our worst fears have been surpassed.

The flight to the suburbs that was well underway in 1952 is still running full tide, draining the central city of middle income families, depriving the District of their tax-payments and their retail shopping dollars.

Then at your 20th birthday party, 5 years ago, we took another look into our familiar metropolitan "can of worms" to find that our problems were bloating and multiplying beyond imagination.

NEEDS IN 1958

We took stock at the 1958 reunion of our needs:

To redevelop and rehabilitate large parts of the central city.

To create healthful, balanced and economically viable suburban growth.

To find means toward redistributing the racial elements of our population.

To start moving on our water supply and pollution problems.

To expand our transportation plant both on rail and asphalt.

At our last meeting I complained to you that our brainpower and energies were being dissipated in prolonged and sterile disputes such as the 7-year bridge-tunnel debate for our Constitution Avenue crossing of the Potomac. It is absolutely scandalous that after 11 years that bridge is still incomplete. It is dangling there in midair, a monument to the obstruction of the Planning Commission, the Fine Arts Commission, the Park Service, and others.

In 1958 I reported to you that Southwest redevelopment has "continually been delayed and bedeviled by crisis after crisis—all of them involving matters of essentially minor importance." The Southwest could have been largely completed by 1958. But again the obstructionists have had a field day. And it may not be done by 1968, unless someone takes action.

CAPITAL OUTLAY

The capital outlay needs we faced in 1952 and 1958 to replenish and care for our antiquated municipal plant have multiplied greatly. Yet only within the past week Congress has once again displayed, in the most revolting form, its lack of responsibility to the National Capital when it shelved the city's request for expanded borrowing authority.

For sheer obstructionism toward the District, the record of this session of Congress is hard to match.

Before the demise of the city's borrowing authority bill, Washingtonians witnessed the spectacle of a southern-dominated House District Subcommittee interposing itself between the Commissioners and a proposed fair housing regulation in an ugly act of legislative extortion.

Just a few days earlier came the burial of a modest piece of legislation that would have cleared the way for planning the revitalization of our blighted downtown.

The action plan for downtown and supporting legislative proposals represent an investment of more than half a million dollars and 2 years of work by two of our most valuable civic action groups—Downtown Progress and the Federal City Council. It

was an investment, I need not remind you, by Washington's much maligned business community.

CONGRESS ROLE

Yet an unresponsive Congress shrugged off the city's pleas for legislation to start the action plan on the road toward realization.

Somewhere in the innumerable pigeon-holes on Capitol Hill dust is also gathering on a bill that would have allowed the city to go ahead with a badly needed 2,000-car garage under the Southwest Mall. A selfish and shortsighted minority of our business fraternity, together with their friends on Capitol Hill, put the Mall parking bill in "cold storage." In the process, they upset a major element of our Southwest plan, which has already been bedeviled by delay and disruption.

The 87th Congress also took a 20-year backward step when it all but abolished the Motor Vehicle Parking Agency and in the process wrecked any hopes for rational parking strategy at the very time our midcity building boom is creating a parking crisis—and with it a potential blighting influence—of major proportions.

But all the blame cannot be unburdened at the doorstep of an obstructionist Congress.

Civic and governmental leadership in the National Capital area is in a bad way. The agencies to which we look for leadership are fighting among themselves and in the process, paralyzing our decisionmaking faculties.

GUERRILLA WARFARE

We have seen our desperately needed expressway system lose all forward momentum during the past 12 months, falling prey to jurisdictional guerrilla warfare between transit partisans and roadbuilders. Mr. Stolzenbach, Administrator of the National Capital Transportation Agency, conceived it as one of his first duties to polarize the transit-freeway battle.

I can think of no more palpable nonsense than the way the obstructionists have urged us to delay project after project until Mr. Stolzenbach's plan is finished. One would think Mr. Stolzenbach was away on a flight to Mars; he has never yet once said that any action could be taken without injuring his mysterious plan.

Our Planning Commission, with one foot solidly planted in the year 2000, has recently tried to soft-shoe its way through controversies over the highway program, and the need for renewal of Georgetown's industrial waterfront. The Commission has not exercised its full measure of leadership in coordinating Federal moves throughout the metropolitan area.

DART GAME

And the Federal Government has been one of the worst transgressors. Executive agencies have been playing a reckless game of darts with the map of Metropolitan Washington.

Instead of working as a positive influence in shaping a rational metropolitan environment, it has done just the opposite. The Central Intelligence Agency's new home at Langley did not even place in a list of 25 sites picked after careful planning research. But Allen Dulles, you may remember, wanted a Princeton type campus setting for his employees and Congressman BROXHILL could not have been more sympathetic.

If that massive blockhouse of the CIA's is campus-type architecture, then I think we ought to rename the Pentagon Harvard Yard.

Another incredible monument to Federal whimsy is the Atomic Energy Commission building, a 45- or 50-minute or longer drive from downtown Washington. The secretaries were the first to rebel at this exile to exurbia. As usual, they had more sense than the planning technicians.

In fact, we have become so numbed by this sort of folly that the scandalous waste of moving NSA to Fort Meade has hardly ever been noted. And now we have the Bureau of Standards and other dispersal-minded agencies doing violence to the most elementary concepts of sound metropolitan planning.

CHAOS UNLEASHED

The dispersers and decentralizers in the Federal Establishment have failed to prove the wisdom of their argument. Instead they have further unleashed the forces of urban chaos in the National Capital region.

There is, on the contrary great sense in the new cluster of Federal buildings along Independence Avenue and at the gateway to the new Southwest. But without companion action to accommodate both the traffic and parking demands of this vast new employment center, it will only build new blight factors into our downtown.

Because of the city's enormous public and private investment in the Southwest, GSA has a compelling responsibility to provide underground parking in the Southwest Mall far at least 4,000 cars. Secondly, GSA should join others in demanding the earliest possible completion of the inner loop, no later than 1970.

There is urgent need for a strong, central checkrein over the various agencies in the executive branch.

It is notable that Washington's best days, as far as the executive branch is concerned, were the years from 1953 to 1958 when under President Eisenhower, Gov. Sherman Adams displayed continuing and intelligent interest in National Capital affairs.

Someday Washington should recognize formally Governor Adams' contribution to our city.

KENNEDY ACTION

It is strange, on the other hand, that the New Frontier waited more than a year and a half before extending its influence to the citizens of Metropolitan Washington through the appointment of Charlie Horsky as Presidential Adviser on National Capital Affairs.

Washington, after all, has been our President's most permanent hometown. It has also been home to many who serve in his administration.

The saving of Lafayette Square is just one example of how much can be achieved with the active, personal interest of President and Mrs. Kennedy. And we can now welcome enthusiastically the appointment of Mr. Horsky for giving institutional support to the President's determination to help Washington.

In Congress, the work of Senator ALAN BIBLE and his Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems has shown us what can be achieved with constructive and enlightened leadership on Capitol Hill. Without Senator BIBLE, we would certainly not have been even as far along toward transit modernization as we are today.

And now I should like to place before you tonight an agenda for action in the National Capital region.

FIVE-YEAR GOALS

It is a program not for the year 2000 but for 1967—5 years from now, something that falls within our mortal capabilities. We have the tools, the money, the civic genius to achieve it. We need only the will.

First, a clean Potomac in which we can once again swim and fish.

Second, a national cultural center to enhance both our Nation and our culture.

Third, although my editorial colleagues at the Washington Post disagree with me, a national aquarium to celebrate nature along with our zoo and opera. For I believe the gifts and wonders of the ocean are as enhancing to man as opera.

Fourth, the rapid flowering of a new downtown which will serve as the vital center

rather than the shame of our metropolitan area.

Fifth, an innerloop freeway that is fully under contract.

Sixth, a functioning metropolitan authority to manage the financing and construction of a regional mass transit system.

Seventh, modern high-speed subway service in our downtown core.

Eighth, a humane and efficient relocation service for families and businesses to insure that our public works undertakings do not streamroller over proprietary rights and individual initiative.

Ninth, completion of plans for the long-neglected Southeast and Northeast quadrants of our city, along both sides of the Anacostia.

Tenth, the blossoming of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Eleventh, completion of the Three Sisters Bridge with perhaps a start on the Fourth or Fifth Sister, as well as a completed access road system to Dulles Airport.

OTHER ASPECTS

But we cannot build a greater National Capital with public works alone.

We must also set our 1967 sights on such goals as these:

Achieving equal housing and job opportunities for Negroes and other minorities.

Strengthening our institutions of higher learning so that we may attract the Nation's keenest and most cultivated minds as well as our due share of the new scientific industries on our periphery.

Coming to grips with our spiraling welfare problems in a way that will attack the underlying social conditions from which our relief loads spring.

Creating larger banking and commercial institutions worthy of a world capital.

Getting more intelligent and responsive representation in the District committees of Congress.

In conclusion, I would say that there has been some good news during the past year to go with the bad. Mr. Horsky's appointment was a heartening demonstration that the administration is recognizing its responsibility to the National Capital.

COOPERATION NEEDED

But, remarkable as he is, and prodigal as are his gifts, he is no miracle man.

He will need the ear of a sympathetic President.

He will need the cooperation of a citizenry that must stop its nay-saying and must, in the words of New York's Bob Moses, ignore the "babel of strident voices" that counsel delay and negativism.

It is not simply an array of problems that face Metropolitan Washington. It is a full-blown crisis.

We must learn to accept the signs of change and growth that will make our Federal City as different in the year 2000 as it was in 1924.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Graham speaks with great feeling and deep concern over long-range future planning. He expresses anxiety over the apparent failure of those responsible to recognize that the present and near future—not alone the distant years—must be reckoned with in any sensible planning for the Capital City of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, as the legislative body of this Capital, the Congress of the United States must heed the warning and advice that this dedicated citizen speaks to. I hope that Mr. Graham's words do not fall on deaf ears in the Congress, and I trust that the official planners look to tomorrow and next year as well as the year 2000.

As one of many in this House of Representatives jealous of and interested in the beauty and proper growth of Washington, I congratulate Mr. Graham for the thought that went into and the excellence of his address to an organization that is so vitally concerned with the affairs of this great city.

PREVIOUS SESSIONS OF CONGRESS

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of the 87th Congress lingers into the middle of the month of October and witnesses the falling leaves in the streets of Washington, many Members of the House have expressed curiosity as to the precedents for such a protracted session. For their information I should like to quote the following statistics with regard to previous sessions of unusual length, which occurred during an election year.

In 1940 the session lasted 366 days—from January 3, 1940, to January 3, 1941.

In 1922 the session lasted 292 days—from December 5, 1921, to September 22, 1922.

In 1914 the session lasted 328 days—from December 1, 1913, to October 24, 1914.

In 1888 the session lasted 321 days—from December 5, 1887, to October 20, 1888.

RETIRING MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, as another session comes to an end, all of us are saddened by the knowledge that some of our good friends and colleagues are retiring from the Congress. I rise today to salute the devoted service, patriotism, and workmanship of five of my colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Representatives ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD, CHESTER E. MERROW, MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH, LAURENCE CURTIS, and HORACE SEELEY-BROWN, Jr., will retire from the Congress and from their seats on the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Each of these distinguished Representatives has earned the respect and admiration of their fellow colleagues on the Foreign Affairs Committee. Although a Democrat and a junior member of the committee, I have received their unfailing assistance and good will in my work on the committee. Without partisan feeling and with the utmost devotion to duty, these Members of Congress have attempted to work for the ideal that only by advancing and protecting

freedom throughout the world can the United States maintain its security and dedication to the principles on which it was founded.

I salute them for their dedicated service to their country and to their constituencies, and I wish them all success in their future endeavors.

RANSOM MONEY FOR CUBAN PRISONERS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we all have great compassion for the men and the families of men taken prisoner by Castro's Communist regime during the Bay of Pigs invasion attempt of Cuba last year. While we all have compassion for their plight and the people of the United States greatly feel that the causes of freedom must be upheld, the principles of this Nation do not condone the payment of ransom by the U.S. Government.

I have already urged the President and the Secretary of State to refuse to allow any U.S. tax dollars to be used for this purpose.

This Nation was faced with a ransom payment in 1805 and defeated those who were so brazen to demand it. That incident occurred in Tripoli and we refused to pay ransom while our Nation was young.

We should do no less while our Nation is great.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. PELLY for October 13 and October 15 on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DEROUNIAN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. MEADER, for 30 minutes, following the special order granted to Mr. DEROUNIAN.

Mr. GIAIMO (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI), today and tomorrow, for 30 minutes each, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 10 minutes, on October 12.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. BARRY of New York), for 15 minutes, on October 12.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL

RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. WILLIAMS.

Mr. PILLION (at the request of Mr. BARRY) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. COLLIER.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. FARESTEIN.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LIBONATI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ANFUSO.

Mr. TOLL.

Mr. ROSENTHAL.

Mr. MACDONALD.

Mr. PURCELL.

Mr. JOHNSON of California in two instances and to include tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PELLY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. CAHILL.

Mr. DADDARIO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GARY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri.

Mr. MULDER in three instances.

Mr. GALLAGHER in three instances.

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 555. An act for the relief of Elmore County, Ala.;

H.R. 1691. An act for the relief of Elaine Veronica Brathwaite and Jessie Bamer;

H.R. 3131. An act for the relief of Richard C. Collins;

H.R. 5260. An act to continue for an additional 3-year period the existing suspensions of the tax on the first domestic processing of coconut oil, palm oil, palm-kernel oil, and fatty acids, salts, combinations, or mixtures thereof;

H.R. 5700. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to permit the designation of certain contract carriers as carriers of bonded merchandise;

H.R. 6190. An act to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the repair or replacement for veterans of certain prosthetic or other appliances damaged or destroyed as a result of certain accidents;

H.R. 6691. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, sections 871 and 3056, to provide penalties for threats against the successors to the Presidency, to authorize their protection by the Secret Service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 6836. An act to amend the Police-men and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act;

H.R. 7791. An act to amend title 13 of the United States Code to provide for the collection and publication of foreign commerce and trade statistics, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8140. An act to strengthen the criminal laws relating to bribery, graft, and conflicts of interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8355. An act to authorize executive agencies to grant easements in, over, or upon real property of the United States under the control of such agencies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8874. An act to authorize certain banks to invest in corporations whose purpose is to provide clerical services for them, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8952. An act to amend the provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the conditions under which the special constructive sale price rule is to apply for purposes of certain manufacturers excise taxes and relating to the taxation of life insurance companies, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9285. An act for the relief of Helenita K. Stephenson;

H.R. 9777. An act to amend Private Law 87-197;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of civilian employees of the New York Naval Shipyard and the San Francisco Naval Shipyard erroneously in receipt of certain wages due to a misinterpretation of a Navy civilian personnel instruction;

H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;

H.R. 10129. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1957, relating to aircraft loan guarantees;

H.R. 10199. An act for the relief of Lester A. Kocher;

H.R. 10423. An act for the relief of Mrs. Dorothy H. Johnson;

H.R. 10541. An act to assist States and communities to carry out intensive vaccination programs designed to protect their populations, particularly all preschool children, against poliomyelitis, diphtheria, whooping cough, and tetanus;

H.R. 10605. An act for the relief of Joan Rosa Orr;

H.R. 10708. An act to amend section 203 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended, with respect to communication service for the transmission of voice, sounds, signals, pictures, writing, or signs of all kinds through the use of electricity;

H.R. 10936. An act to permit the Postmaster General to extend contract mail routes up to 100 miles during the contract term, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11058. An act for the relief of Carl Adams;

H.R. 11578. An act for the relief of Don C. Jensen and Bruce E. Woolner;

H.R. 11899. An act to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1940, as amended, to provide for a Federal telecommunications fund;

H.R. 12313. An act for the relief of Jane Froman, Gypsy Markoff, and Jean Rosen;

H.R. 12402. An act for the relief of Conchetta Maria, Rosetta, and Tomasino Mangiaracina;

H.R. 12513. An act to provide for public notice of settlement in patent interferences, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12599. An act relating to the income tax treatment of terminal railroad corporations and their shareholders, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on October 10, 1962, present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 7283. An act to amend the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to provide compensation for certain World War II losses;

H.R. 8938. An act to provide a more definitive tariff classification description for lightweight bicycles;

H.R. 10650. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit for investment in certain depreciable property, to eliminate certain defects and inequities, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 712. Joint resolution to direct the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Commission to consider possible changes in the winning design for the proposed memorial or the selection of a new design for such memorial.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 12, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2624. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audit of General Services Administration (GSA) contract DMP-78 with Harvey Aluminum (Inc.) of Torrance, Calif.; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2625. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2626. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 903. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee of conference. S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2552). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Report on the activities of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. H.R. 12648. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2554). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MILLS: Committee of conference. H.R. 10620. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses (Rept. No. 2555). Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 13396. A bill to promote the economic and social development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 13397. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Permanent Commission on Governmental Operations; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 13398. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950 by the addition of certain provisions for injunctions against Communist organizations; grand jury investigations of enforcement; priority of trials; more severe punishment in cases of violations by employees on the staff of the White House, Congress and Supreme Court; power to deny bail; appropriate supervision of convicts during confinement; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 13399. A bill to provide that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 13400. A bill to facilitate payroll administration in the House of Representatives by fixing at multiples of \$60 the basic compensation of certain positions thereunder; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 13401. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Johnstown-Conemaugh National Historic Site in the State of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H.J. Res. 903. Joint resolution making continuing appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.J. Res. 904. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and the District of Columbia to negotiate and enter into a compact to establish a multi-State authority to construct and operate a passenger rail transportation system within the area of such States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 834. Resolution to provide for printing of the transcript of the remarks incident to the character and service of Hon. JAMES C. DAVIS; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.R. 13402. A bill for the relief of Lily Isabell Watkins; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 13403. A bill for the relief of Johnny Brodersen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 13404. A bill for the relief of Mark Blais Ellingsen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13405. A bill for the relief of Eleni Papapostolou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 13406. A bill for the relief of Grazia R. Vella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 13407. A bill for the relief of Changeez Banikarim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 13408. A bill to provide for the relief of certain enlisted members and former en-

listed members of the Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 13409. A bill for the relief of Paja Radojevic and his wife Zlata Radojevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

415. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Omaha Branch Organization for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

416. By Mr. FOUNTAIN: Petition of Jesse M. Seaver, Margarettsville, N.C., on

behalf of the Carolina Christian Union, disapproving the recent decision of the Supreme Court on the subject of prayer in the public schools of New York and proposing an amendment with respect to freedom of religion providing that "the conduct of traditional and customary religious customs and practices in public schools and other public institutions, including the reading of the Bible, prayers and singing, shall not be enjoined or prohibited"; that "neither the United States nor any State may deny or abridge the right of any person to engage in or refrain from engaging in any bona fide religious custom or practice, or from holding any religious belief" and that "neither the United States nor any State may establish a sectarian religion"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Casimir Pulaski—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, 183 years ago, on October 11, 1779, a great Polish patriot died for a great cause, the American Revolution.

Our observance today of Casimir Pulaski's death is a reminder to all Americans that the cause of freedom transcends national boundaries and that it joins together in common brotherhood brave and courageous men whatever their origin.

Casimir Pulaski was a freedom fighter in his native Poland before he gave his life to the cause of American independence. The son of a Polish count, Pulaski had fought valiantly but unsuccessfully to overthrow the Russian domination of his beloved Poland. His military achievements were heroic, but the forces he led were crushed and scattered and his personal property was confiscated. Pulaski, at 24 years of age, was forced to flee to Turkey. There he spent several years unsuccessfully trying to influence Turkey to help Poland. Finally, he reached Paris. Penniless and without employment, the young Pulaski eagerly sought to lend his valuable services to the American cause.

It was through the assistance of Benjamin Franklin that Pulaski sailed for the United States with a letter of introduction to George Washington. He joined Washington's forces and distinguished himself in the Battle of Brandywine. As a reward, Congress appointed this gallant soldier a brigadier general in charge of cavalry. He soon organized an independent corps of cavalry and light infantry which became known as Pulaski's Legion. This legion participated in the siege of Savannah, Ga. It was in this battle that the young Polish freedom fighter was mortally wounded on October 9, 1779. He died 2 days later.

This anniversary of Casimir Pulaski's death provides a welcome opportunity to

reaffirm traditional Polish-American friendship. The courage and idealism displayed by this Polish patriot during our Revolution rekindles our great admiration for the Polish people and reinforces our faith in their ultimate victory in restoring freedom to Poland.

Racial Discrimination in Educational Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which provides that no Federal financial or other assistance may be extended to any educational institution which discriminates against students or prospective students on account of race, religion, color, ancestry or national origin.

This legislation has been offered primarily in an effort to put a stop to the shameful exhibitions of racial discrimination now in existence in some of our institutions of higher learning, a practice most recently spotlighted by the actions of the University of Mississippi in refusing admission to a young Negro, who, as an American citizen, is entitled to the rights and privileges guaranteed under the Constitution.

Our great country was founded on the basic principles that all men are created equal, regardless of race, creed or color. If we are to continue our position of leadership in the world today, and if we are to continue to preach democracy, freedom, and equality to the rest of the world, then we must put our own house in order and eliminate every vestige of racial discrimination which exists in these United States.

In 1954 the Supreme Court handed down its historic desegregation decision. Yet in 1962—8 years later—there are still educational institutions flagrantly violating the law of the land and the basic principles upon which our country was

founded. It is the responsibility of the Congress to enact strong laws for the protection of the rights and freedoms of each and every citizen. For that reason I am hopeful that the Congress will give favorable consideration in the future to the enactment of my bill. In my opinion, any educational institution which restricts admission of students in defiance of our Constitution, certainly is not entitled to any assistance from the Federal Government in the development or furtherance of its educational programs.

Voting Record of Congressman Richard H. Ichord on Major Issues and Measures of Great Import in the 87th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 11, 1962

Mr. ICHORD of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my voting record on 35 of the most important bills to come before the House of Representatives during the 1961 and 1962 sessions of the 87th Congress. I am doing this after observing the record vote of Congressman WAYNE HAYS, which he inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on October 2. Congressman HAYS stated that he has done this every 2 years since coming to Congress and mailed out the same in order that his constituents may conveniently check his record. I am doing likewise as I, too, believe that the voters of every district not only have the right to know how their Congressman votes, but also they have the duty to know. Democracy must have a fully informed electorate in order to continue and prosper.

All of the voters will obviously not agree with their Congressman on every issue as it is impossible for any two men or women to always see alike; but nevertheless the record should be made available to the electorate.